Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER

AND

GENERAL REVIEW.

VOL. XX.

THIRD SERIES, VOL. II.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY CHARLES BOWEN.

LONDON:
ROWLAND HUNTER, AND R. J. KENNETT, GREAT QUEEN STREET.

1836.

CAMBRIDGE:
PRINTED BY CHARLES FOLSOM.

CONTENTS
OF
VOL. XX. — THIRD SERIES, VOL. II.

No. I.

ART. I. — Erinnerungen an Dr. FRIEDRICH SCHLEIERMACHER, von FRIEDRICH LÜCKE.—Recollections of SCHLEIERMACHER. - 1

ART. II. — The Stranger's Gift. Edited by HERMANN BOKUM. 47

ART. III. — 1. The Comprehensive Commentary on the Holy Bible. Edited by Rev. WILLIAM JENKS, D. D.
2. The same. [Baptist Edition.] Re-edited by Rev. JOSEPH A. WARNE.
3. Notes on the Gospels. By ALBERT BARNES.
4. Notes on the Acts of the Apostles. By ALBERT BARNES.
5. Notes on the Epistle to the Romans. By ALBERT BARNES. 54

ART. IV. — 1. An Address delivered before the Young Men's Temperance Society in Lowell, March 8th, 1835. By ELISHA BARTLETT, M. D.
2. An Address delivered before the Massachusetts State Temperance Society, May 31st, 1835. By the Rev. SAMUEL K. LOTHROP.
3. Proceedings of the Temperance Convention held in Boston on the twenty-third of September, 1835. - - 72

ART. V. — Sermon sur Pseaume cxxvi. 3. Par M. le Pasteur et Professeur CHENEVIÈRE.
A Sermon on Psalms cxxvi. 3. By M. CHENEVIÈRE, Pastor and Professor. - - - - - 106

ART. VI. — 1. Letters from Spain. By Don LEUCADIO DOBLADO.
2. Practical and Internal Evidence against Catholicism. By the Rev. JOSEPH BLANCO WHITE.
3. The Poor Man's Preservative against Popery. By the Rev. JOSEPH BLANCO WHITE.
4. Second Travels of an Irish Gentleman in Search of a Religion. With Notes and Illustrations, NOT by the EDITOR OF "CAPTAIN ROCK'S MEMOIRS."
5. Observations on Heresy and Orthodoxy. By the Rev. JOSEPH BLANCO WHITE. - - - - 111

NOTICES AND INTELLIGENCE. — The Sacred Offering. — Sacred Memoirs. — Goodwin's Lectures on the Atheistical Controversy. — New Publications. - - - - 135

No. II.

ART. I. — Animal and Vegetable Physiology considered with reference to Natural Theology. By PETER MARK ROGET, M. D., Secretary to the Royal Society, &c. - - 137

ART. II. — De l'Influence des Mœurs sur les Lois, et de l'Influence des Lois sur les Mœurs. Par M. MATTER. - - - 153

ART. III. — 1. The Morning and Evening Sacrifice.
2. The Last Supper, or Christ's Death kept in Remembrance.
3. Farewell to Time, or Last Views of Life, and Prospects of Immortality.
4. The True Plan of a Living Temple. - - - 169

ART. IV — Scenes and Characters Illustrating Christian Truth. No. V. The Backslider. By ***. - - - - 198

ART. V. — Meaning of the title "Angel of Jehovah," as used in Scripture; being in continuation of the Article on the "Deity of the Messiah not a Doctrine of the Old Testament." - - - - - - - - 207

ART. VI. — A Sermon delivered in Worcester, January 31, 1836, by AARON BANCROFT, D. D., at the Termination of Fifty Years of his Ministry. - - - - - - 240

ART. VII. — Miscellanies. By HARRIET MARTINEAU. - 251

ART. VIII. — A Narrative of a Visit to England. By JOHN CODMAN, D. D. - - - - - - - 265

NOTICES AND INTELLIGENCE. — Glasgow Edition of the Works of William Ellery Channing, D. D. — Dr. Carpenter's Harmony of the Gospels. — Religious Consolation. — New Publications. - - - - - - - 269

No. III.

ART. I. — The Life of Philip Melancthon. By F. A. Cox, D. D. 273

ART. II. — The True Plan of a Living Temple. By the Author of "The Morning and Evening Sacrifice," &c. (Concluded.) 291

ART. III. — An Impartial Exposition of the Evidences and Doctrines of the Christian Religion. By J. H. MCCULLOH, Jr., M. D. - - - - - - - - 307

ART. IV. — The "Angel of Jehovah," mentioned in the Old Testament, not identical with the Messiah. (Concluded.) - 329

ART. V. — 1. The Primitive Creed, Examined and Explained; in Two Parts. By JOHN HENRY HOPKINS, D. D.

2. Christianity Vindicated, in Seven Discourses on the External Evidences. By JOHN HENRY HOPKINS, D. D.

3. The Primitive Church, compared with the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Present Day. By JOHN HENRY HOPKINS, D. D. - - - - - - - 342

ART. VI. — On the Penitentiary System in the United States, and its Application in France. By G. DE BEAUMONT and A. DE TOCQUEVILLE. - - - - - - 376

ART. VII. — 1. Mirror of Calvinistic Fanaticism. By RUSSELL STREETER.

2. Sermons, Addresses and Exhortations, by Rev. JEDEDIAH BURCHARD, with an Appendix. By C. G. EASTMAN. - 393

NOTICES AND INTELLIGENCE. — Fox's Sketch of the Reformation. — Hug's Introduction to the New Testament. — Passow's Greek Lexicon. - - - - - - 403

INDEX - - - - - - - - 405

THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

No. LXXIII.

THIRD SERIES — No. IV.

MARCH, 1836.

ART. I. — *Theologische Studien und Kritiken. Eine Zeitschrift für das gesammte Gebiet der Theologie, in Verbindung mit* Dr. GIESELER, Dr. LÜCKE, *und* Dr. NITZSCH, *herausgegeben von* Dr. C. ULLMANN *und* Dr. F. W. C. UMBREIT. Zweiter Band. 1834. *Erinerungen an* Dr. FRIEDRICH SCHLEIERMACHER *von* FRIEDRICH LÜCKE.

Recollections of SCHLEIERMACHER.

THE history of modern theology in Germany presents few names more distinguished than that of Frederic Schleiermacher. A large class, indeed, in his own country would place him, without a rival, at the head of all theologians of the present day. We are aware of the great difficulty, under circumstances so different as our own from those with which they are surrounded, of forming a just estimate of the eminent men of foreign lands. In no department is this difficulty felt to a wider extent, than in the literature of Germany, and especially in every thing connected with its recent developements in philosophy and theology. Our habitual modes of thought, our English predilections in literature, and our rigid exaction of the laws of taste with which we are most familiar, preclude us from that ready sympathy with the productions of their great masters, which is essential to a correct judgment of any work of art. The tendency of mind, even among our most highly educated men, is so little in the direction of profound speculation, that we are apt to imagine that all inquiries, which descend much below the surface, are not only dark and repulsive,

but useless and even dangerous. The German mind, on the other hand, is so absorbed in the investigation of fundamental principles, in inquiries which serve, not merely to accumulate opulent stores of exact knowledge, but to settle the relative validity and true foundation of every kind of knowledge, that the outward forms of expression are often neglected, and the most original and fruitful ideas clothed in difficult and forbidding language.

For this reason, and others of a similar character, we do not suppose that a mind like that of Schleiermacher, is likely to excite a deep interest among us; or that the veneration, which is expressed for it among all classes of his own countrymen, will find a response with many of our readers. At the same time, we cannot believe that a man who has imprinted the mark of his own individuality so deeply upon the highest literature of his nation, can be destitute of claims upon the sympathy and admiration of intelligent minds, though trained under a discipline widely different from their own.

It is not our purpose, however, to present an analysis of Schleiermacher's genius, or to enforce his merits upon the attention of our philosophical theologians. Our words concerning him must be few, and chiefly in an historical connexion. It is often said that a great man is to be regarded as the exponent and the product of his age. This maxim is true in its fullest extent as applied to Schleiermacher. He represents an important epoch in the progress of thought, in its relations to a scientific theology. A person acquainted with the intellectual movements in Germany, since the latter part of the last century, might have ventured to predict the appearance of a man like Schleiermacher, who, receiving a strong impression from the circumstances of the times, was destined himself to give a new direction to the current of thought, which had broken down its ancient barriers, and had as yet found no channel of sufficient strength or capacity to retain it within its appropriate limits.

The problem of Schleiermacher's life was determined by the historical relations which preceded and accompanied the period of his literary activity. This problem, it will be seen in the sequel of the present article, was to reconcile the conflicting claims of religion and science, as they were exhibited in the state of intellectual cultivation in his own country. In the solution of this problem, Schleiermacher developed certain

theological principles, which may be said to form a new era in the history of the science, and which have certainly created a large and increasing school among the modern theologians of Germany. A few brief statements will be sufficient to illustrate the position which he occupied.

The writings of the English Deists were for the most part translated into the German language, and produced a deep impression on the minds of thinking men, both within and without the official precincts of theology. This impression was increased by the spirit of the French Revolution and the tendency of the King of Prussia towards a superficial literature and a material philosophy. The prevailing opinions in the Lutheran Church were not competent to present a barrier against the approaching torrent of skepticism and infidelity. The consequence was, that, after the Scriptures had been submitted to a critical examination of great extent and thoroughness, the doctrines of theology discussed on all sides with the utmost freedom, and the philosophy of religion made the subject of new and profound investigations, a new form of Christianity was presented, which admitted the essential truth of the ideas revealed by Jesus Christ, and their divine authority as coming from God, but denied their claims to a miraculous or supernatural character. This is the leading principle of the system of Rationalism. This system, the result of a scientific examination of the records of religion, but unaccompanied with a profound estimate of its inward spirit, has prevailed until within the last fifteen or twenty years, among the most celebrated theologians of Germany without any effectual opposition. About that time a reaction began to take place. Many, who had formerly been ardently attached to it, relaxed in their zeal, or took a new tendency in the opposite direction. The want of a more spiritual religion was distinctly and loudly expressed. Rationalism was charged with coldness and inefficiency, with being destitute of a deep philosophical foundation, and with inadequacy to meet the necessities of the religious nature of man. Still it was seen, that no help could be obtained from the literal and precise orthodoxy of the ancient standards of the Lutheran church. The common ideas on inspiration, on the nature of revelation, on the character of the sacred books, on the evidences of Christianity, and on the doctrines of the Christian faith, which were maintained in those formularies, could not be brought into harmony with the

improved science of modern times, or the results of sound and thorough critical investigations. It appeared, that the prevailing Rationalism would not do, and that the ancient Supernaturalism would do still less. The problem then was to discover some scientific principles, by which the merits of both systems could be secured and their defects avoided.

The solution of this problem was the mission of Schleiermacher's life. We will concisely indicate the process which he adopted. He admitted the validity of critical investigations to their fullest extent. These, he could not but perceive, had abolished the foundation on which the prevailing views of the Bible had reposed. Hence, it was necessary to draw the sharpest line of distinction between religion in its essential elements, and religion in its outward manifestations. Instead then of taking his stand in the written letter, he commenced with the religious consciousness of human nature. He aimed not so much to carry over the spirit of Christianity into the soul, as to awaken the soul itself to a sense of its affinity with the essential revelations of the Gospel, and to lead it to embrace them with a consciousness of sympathy and relationship. But here two grand points were clearly to be settled as the condition of all further progress; first, what is the essential character of religion in the soul; and second, what is the peculiar spirit of Christianity, to which this character corresponds. These points are discussed by Schleiermacher with all the logical acuteness which was eminently characteristic of his mind. The results at which he arrives may be stated in a few words. Religion, he supposes, in its primitive elements, is neither knowledge nor action, but a sense of our dependence on God, and of our need of redemption from sin. The seat of this feeling is the primitive consciousness of human nature. As to the second point, the essential spirit of Christianity is to be found in those principles, which have universally prevailed in the Christian church, from the time of the Apostles to the present day. These, of course, are not always to be taken in their literal sense, and never in that of the symbols and illustrations, with which it has been attempted to make them clear to the understanding. There have ever been great differences in the modes of conceiving essential ideas. And the difficulty has been, that these various modes have been confounded with the primitive and unchanging truth. In all general conceptions of religion, then, as well as in the records of revelation, we must

not fail to look beyond the letter to the spirit, to separate the central and absolute idea from the temporary forms with which it is surrounded. In this mode, Schleiermacher attempts to demonstrate the validity of the primary truths of the Gospel, in their relation to the religious consciousness of man, as they have been held in some form or other, by the great body of believers in the church from the time of its foundation.

If we are now asked, whether Schleiermacher is to be classed among the Rationalists or the Supernaturalists, as they are arranged in German theology, we answer that he belongs to both, inasmuch as he admits the most valuable distinctions and principles of each of those schools. He holds, with perfect faith, to the supernatural character, the miracles, and the divine mission of Jesus Christ; and at the same time he would reinstate the authority of reason, and establish the claims of religion in harmony with those of a sound philosophy. He perceives, in the revelation of the Gospel, a fountain, which corresponds with the wants of our religious nature, and which flows directly from the throne of God; and at the same time he does not forget, that the streams which issue from this fountain must partake of the character of the soil and other accidental influences, to which they are exposed. He regards the spirit of Christ as having been filled with all the fulness of God, and, at the same time, he remembers the human relations in which this spirit was manifested. Schleiermacher thus reconciles some of the most perplexing antitheses between the two opposing systems, and lays a broad foundation for a faith which is equally in accordance with the results of science and the wants of the heart.

A question, perhaps, of still greater interest may now be asked by our readers; With which of the two great religious divisions in this country, is Schleiermacher to be ranked? We answer, With neither. He occupied a station which has found no representative in our own theological progress. We add, that his views are capable of doing service to both of the leading schools in this country. If in no other respect, he may inspire us all with a feeling of the importance of connecting philosophy and theology in the most intimate harmony, by pointing out to each its peculiar province,—of exercising a spirit of tolerance and charity towards the faithful strivings of every seeker of truth,—and of recognising, in the nature of man, the same signatures of Divinity which authenticate the Gospel of Christ.

The article which follows was written immediately after the decease of Schleiermacher, by Dr. Lücke, Professor of Theology, at Göttingen, who was connected with him in the relations of an intimate friendship, sympathy of opinion, and similarity of pursuits. It is written in a style, which we do not admire, and which makes it difficult to be converted into a form, to which we are at all accustomed in our own language. We fear that we have not succeeded in clothing it with a befitting English dress; but, on account of the interesting view which it presents of Schleiermacher's doings as a theologian and his character as a man, we venture to submit it to the attention of our theological public. It is taken from the work named at the head of this article, one of the most valuable theological publications of the present day, to which Schleiermacher himself was a frequent contributor.

A short sketch of Schleiermacher's life may be necessary to a complete understanding of the article, and we accordingly subjoin it. He was born at Breslau, the capital of Silesia, on the 21st of November, 1768, and consequently was in his 66th year, at the time of his death, which took place on the 12th of February, 1834. His early education was received at different Moravian seminaries, from which body of Christians he derived his first religious impressions, and to which he always manifested a strong attachment in after life. The tendencies which his mind received from the Moravian Brethren were never wholly renounced, but distinct traces of their influence may be perceived in his subsequent history. He separated from this community, however, at the age of nineteen, and became a member of the Reformed Church in Germany. His studies were continued at the University of Halle, which at that time, as well as the present, contained one of the most important theological schools on the continent of Europe. Under the auspices of such teachers as Wolf, Eberhard, Knapp, and Nösselt, he laid a solid foundation for his progress in philosophy and theology. Having completed his studies at Halle, he spent a short time as private instructer in a Prussian noble family, and then became member of a celebrated seminary for teachers, under the care of Gedike, at Berlin. After receiving ordination as a preacher, he officiated for a short time as assistant minister at Landsberg on the Warta, and then received the appointment of preacher to the Hospital of Charity in Berlin. He held this station from 1796 to 1802, when he

became court preacher at Stolpe, which office he soon left for that of University Preacher and Professor of Theology and Philosophy at Halle. When that University was suspended during the wars of Napoleon, he returned to Berlin, where he became established as minister at the Trinity Church, and, upon the opening of the University in that city in 1810, he received the appointment of Professor of Theology, in which office he continued until his death. He commenced his literary career with the translation of Joseph Fawcett's Sermons, and this was soon after followed by the translation of Blair's Sermons, which he undertook in conjunction with his friend Sack. From such a commencement no one could have augured the future position which he was destined to occupy. But he soon revealed the power and depth of his intellect in his celebrated Discourses on Religion, of which a further notice is given by Dr. Lücke. This established his character as a profound thinker and an eloquent writer. From this period he maintained an ever-growing reputation in the highest departments of German literature, which he has contributed to illustrate, in no small degree, by his numerous publications on philosophy, theology, and criticism, and on many of the important practical topics of the day. His activity as a scholar presents a beautiful specimen of the almost incredible achievements of the men of letters in Germany; and the influence of his character and writings has established a school, which numbers in its ranks many of the most brilliant minds to be found in the walks of theology, and which promises to advance, with no insignificant progress, the essential interests both of science and of the church. G. R.

Dr. Lücke's Recollections of Schleiermacher.

Schleiermacher is to be numbered among those highly gifted individuals, who possess the creative power and presiding genius to diffuse new light and life in every department to which they are called by their circumstances or their taste. He was born with a commanding and kingly nature. He acted in many different spheres, which demanded the most opposite talents, but in all of them he exerted a great and signal authority. He was a learned theologian and preacher of the

divine word, a philosopher, and philologist; he was known to the public at large, as a powerful writer on the most important interests of the day; and in the circle of practical affairs, in which he was engaged, he was the object of the highest esteem and love. It is not my purpose to give a full and complete description of the manifold endowments and merits of Schleiermacher. This is the province of a special biography, for which there will not be wanting, among the intimate friends of his later years, either the ability or the will. I shall confine myself to the department in which he was at home from the beginning, and to which he was destined both by his native inclinations and his official duties, — the department of theology and of the church. In this, few have exerted an influence like him. When Dr. Neander received the intelligence of the death of his beloved teacher and colleague, he announced it to his auditory in these words; "A man has been taken away, from whom a new epoch in theology will hereafter be dated." There will probably be those, who, from ignorance or petty jealousy or party spirit, will be inclined to call this in question. But I have no fear, that, the more his influence is developed in all its compass and relations, the judgment of posterity will not confirm the impression that was experienced during the first pangs of grief for his departure. Posterity, after an intelligent and unprejudiced examination, will pronounce him to be the individual, with whom a new direction in theology and the church took its effectual commencement.

To speak in general terms, Schleiermacher marks the transition of the Protestant church and theology in Germany, from the negative, critical, and destructive tendency, to the re-organic and positive Reformation, which is now going on around us. In this reformation there are two directions, a retrograde and a progressive movement. The retrograde movement consists in the resumption of positive Christianity with all the fulness and depth of religious feeling, the restoration of a strict and connected system of Christian thought, and the revival of the idea of fellowship and communion in the visible church. These are the unchangeable elements of all sound Christian life. Our Protestant theology and church are built on this foundation. They can never be lost in the church of Jesus Christ. But for a long time among us they were more or less darkened, scattered, deprived of power.

It is the problem of the present time to collect them again, and to clothe them with fresh life and strength. But this is impossible without the living progress of the science, which constantly separates all that is merely human, adventitious, unessential, all that is traditional and arbitrary, from the original word of God, and gives freedom and power to the inward spirit, which lies hid in the bondage of the outward letter. While it does this, it also preserves and quickens the original form; while it opens the meaning of the divine word in its height and depth, it shuts out from it for ever all contradiction and doubt. This science for the most part will proceed in a critical direction. But all criticism is not progressive and reforming. We have known a school of criticism, which, without the Christian spirit or experience, pretended to understand and to judge the fulness of the Gospel through mere barrenness, which explained faith through unbelief, and truth through fictions and fancies. There was no saving power in this, but only decline and corruption. The most painful experience has taught us, that genuine criticism can proceed only from the fulness and concentration of the Christian life, that Christian science has no power or right to judge of the truth of the Gospel, and according to this truth to pronounce sentence upon all forms of error, except when it has been baptized, with faith and humility, in the depths of the divine word.

The youth of Schleiermacher fell in the time when the spirit of criticism, — first awakened by Semler in Christian history, and by Kant in philosophy, — commenced its salutary contest with the tasteless and imbecile forms of an antiquated orthodoxy. It was the same time in which, after a long period of tranquillity, the elements of political, literary, and religious life were thrown into a tempest of commotion, and the ancient institutions and observances of our father-land fearfully shaken. Schleiermacher was brought up in a community which seemed, by its very nature, to be shut out from the revolutionary movements of the day; but it was impossible for him to regard them without interest, since he belonged to those independent and active spirits, who are destined to create progress where they do not find it, and the element of whose life consists in free investigation, inquiry, and doubt. In the dedication of his "Discourses on Religion" to his early friend Brinckmann, in Stockholm, who had been brought up with him among the United Brethren, he reminds him of the time, "when the ideas of the

two youthful companions were unfolded together, when, released through their own spirit, from the same yoke, in the free and sincere pursuit of truth, they began to experience that harmony with the universe, which a secret prophetic impulse announced to them for their highest aim, and of which, life, in all its comprehensiveness and perfection, was to be an ever-growing manifestation." But under the full influence of the free, critical spirit, which, even in the seclusion and quiet of his Moravian home, drew him into the excitements of the day, and afterwards, when he entered upon the broader field of a university life and the Protestant church, compelled him to take a lively and effective interest in all the questions, inquiries, and doubts that were agitated, he yet remained faithful to the deep religious spirit, with which God had endowed him, and which had received its first powerful impulse and decided direction to the fulness of life in Jesus Christ and his church, in the bosom of the Moravian community. I have never been able to read without emotion the passage in the "Discourses on Religion," in which Schleiermacher expresses his grateful remembrance of his early religious education. "Piety," says he, "was the motherly bosom, in whose holy seclusion my youthful life was nourished, and prepared for the world which had not yet opened upon it; my spirit breathed its atmosphere, before it had found its appropriate sphere in science and the experience of life; it aided me when I began to examine the faith which I had inherited, and to purify my thoughts and feelings from the ruins of antiquity; it remained with me, when the God and the immortality of my childish conceptions disappeared before the eye of doubt;* it directed me when I was without fixed

---

[* The language here used may appear to many readers, as a confession of youthful skepticism, on the two fundamental points of religious belief. This construction, however, would be unjust to the character of Schleiermacher. He is describing a process which probably few minds inclined to philosophical speculation cannot verify by an appeal to their own inward experience. In searching for the ultimate foundation of religious faith, we often find that certain modes of conception, with which we have long been familiar, cannot sustain the test of a critical examination. At the same time, we may have identified the essential truths of religion, to so great a degree, with these purely personal conceptions, that when the falsity of the latter is demonstrated, it seems for a moment, as if we had lost our hold of the former. At least, when the confiding faith of childhood in its own representations is removed, the reality of their objects becomes dim, although we may

purposes in active life; it pointed out to me the way in which, with my advantages and my defects, I was to maintain the dominion of holiness in my undivided being; and through its influence alone I have become acquainted with friendship and love."

It was in this manner, that the nature and life of Schleiermacher were moved and commanded by two equally powerful forces. With his perfect soundness of mind, he could not think of sacrificing one to the other, but only of securing both in their peculiar sphere and rights, of protecting and perfecting them. At a very early period he recognised the great problem of forming such a union between free, scientific investigation, and the piety which is in subjection to the word of God and Christianity, that the contradiction and hostility, which had been caused between them by the agitations of the times, might be finally destroyed. The solution of this problem was the peculiar labor of his whole life. He attempted this in the hazardous way of separation, pursuing both elements in their distinctive character to their highest and deepest points of union. He separated theology and philosophy, faith and speculation, church and state, with all the dialectic subtilty which belonged to his genius. But while he pointed out the special province of each of these antitheses, in which each could unfold and complete its own nature, undisturbed by its opposite, he retained with equal heartiness and clearness the firm persuasion of religious feeling; that, as both are one in the deepest roots of our spiritual life, so must an entire unity and reconcili-

---

not actually call in question their existence. In this state of transition from what may be called the spontaneous faith of nature, to the scientific faith of reflection, there is often an interval, when "neither sun nor star appears" for a great length of time, and "no small tempest lays upon us," yet we do not renounce our confidence that a clear light will yet break forth from the eastern sky. This is the state of mind to which Schleiermacher alludes, and which in him was the preparation for a strong and masculine faith in the Invisible, such as is usually the fruit only of much self-discipline, and a faithful separation between the errors of education and the everlasting truth, which has its roots alike in the nature of man and of God. Schleiermacher himself takes care to let us know, that it was far from his intention to intimate by these words, that there was ever a time when he was an unbeliever or an atheist, and remarks, that no one could so understand him, who had ever felt the speculative difficulties in the usual anthropomorphitical conceptions of the Supreme Being, — difficulties which are expressed in very decided terms even in the writings of the most profound fathers of the church. See "Reden über die Religion," pp. 26, 27. — Tr.]

ation be the result of every sound developement of their separate elements. He regarded this harmony, however, not as a speculative formula of faith, with which all contemplation must begin, nor as an easy acquisition, which the slothful or frivolous could become masters of by half-way efforts, but as the vast problem and final result of the united and strenuous labors of all thinking men in every department of life; of course it might easily happen, that, while he was principally employed in the labor of analysis and separation, as his immediate object, the inattentive observer might feel authorized to class him among the dividing, destructive, and desolating spirits of the time, rather than among the reconciling, creating, and reforming lovers of truth. But whoever contemplated his mode of thinking and acting on a broad scale, must soon have perceived, that he was one of those exalted individuals, in whose peculiar characters the best and noblest features of their age are concentrated, and the special problem of whose life coincides with the most important problem of their age; that is, in this instance, the reformation of religion by an equally powerful division and reconciliation of conflicting elements. It was his great merit, not only to recognise the wants of the age, in point of religious reform, but to contribute in no small degree to their satisfaction, by the influence of his peculiar thinking and acting in the sphere of theology.

Schleiermacher would have sustained a high and commanding rank in every other department, as well as in theology. The period in which he selected this for his peculiar calling was that in which Spalding found it necessary to defend the utility of the sacred office.* The State presented more bril-

---

[* Spalding was a popular preacher of considerable eminence in his day at Berlin. He was the author of several valuable treatises on the art of preaching, in which he urges the importance of a more rational and practical style of pulpit instruction, than generally prevailed at that time. The work which is here spoken of is entitled "Ueber die Nutzbarkeit des Predigtamts und deren Beförderung," Third edition, 1791. It was written at a period, when religion was regarded with great indifference throughout Germany, and had suffered much both from the influence of French infidelity, and the cold and barren formality of the Lutheran Church. Spalding vindicates the importance of the pastoral office in reply to the objections of Hume, but insists on a thorough improvement in the clergy, in the doctrines of the church, and in the modes of worship, before its complete utility can be realized. His work occasioned a protracted controversy, in which Herder, among others, took an active part. — Tr.]

liant prospects to his view than the Church. Every other science could easily have appeared more congenial to his mind than theology, in which perhaps at that time, more than at any other, there prevailed a general want of culture, disgusting controversies, and ruinous confusion. But he chose the calling of theology and the church, because he was impelled to it by the inmost feelings of his nature. The church and theology were early the central points of his activity; his love for them increased with his years; his philosophical and philological studies were never merely matters of amusement or curiosity, but his profound and rare attainments in them served as the ornament and completion of his theological preëminence.

Schleiermacher did not accomplish the reformation of the age in theology without aid. No great man stands alone, independent of the sympathy and assistance of his contemporaries. But Schleiermacher took the precedence with genuine originality; he was the principal means of exciting and conducting a new creation in theology, and the best helpers and partakers of his work were formed by himself. He has founded a school, inasmuch as, from the time of his first entrance as preacher and teacher of theology at Halle, he gathered around him a crowd of hearers, filled with enthusiasm and reverence, whom he firmly attached to his person, and who, quickened and excited by the influence of his writings and discourses, have since labored and still continue to labor in the spirit of their master. There are few to be found among those who have aided in giving a new direction to theology, who do not owe their best and strongest impulse to the lectures or publications of Schleiermacher. Indeed, all modern theologians have indirectly been his pupils, even those who now pursue a different and an entirely contrary direction. His influence is presupposed in the formation of every one. If in this sense he founded a school, in another sense he did not. It was his custom to act more by suggestion than by prescription, — in a broad, expansive, and liberal manner, rather than in the spirit of exclusiveness, limitation, or authority. He had no wish to found a school which should appear with a distinct party purpose, sealed and locked up to all further progress. With all the power and acuteness of his peculiar genius, he cherished too high a sense of the dignity of science and religion, to permit such a narrow procedure. It was at war with his liberal and comprehensive mind. As he himself remained a seeker,

ζητητικὸς, to the end of his days, in the midst of the certainty and richness of what he had already found, — as he regarded free individuality among the highest blessings of life, — so he was always anxious, in the influence which he exerted, to form every one as a seeker for truth with earnestness and love, to give such freedom and freshness to the individuality of each, that, whatever impulse he might receive from without, he should yet possess the truth as his own property, in his own way. Free, self-acting, independent scholars he wished to draw around him; but slavish imitators and followers were his aversion.

Indeed, there were not a few of his pupils, who, although they had received from him their first impulse towards the new direction in theology, afterwards became in part his opponents. This has given trouble to many of Schleiermacher's friends, particularly when they observed, that those who attacked him had either borrowed their weapons, in the first instance, from him, or had learned their use from his instructions. According to his spirit, we can only censure them, when, ungrateful for his influence, they have put an end to the relations of love, which they sustained to him. No man was less disturbed on account of any difference of views from his own, than Schleiermacher himself. He was not without feeling for affectionate recognition and alliance; a want of appreciation and unfriendly desertion were painful to him; but he always took sincere pleasure in the diversity of relations and directions in matters of opinion, in opposing theories and honorable contests.

In addition to the element of mental freedom, this fact had a peculiar ground in his own nature, and I am sure that Schleiermacher was aware of it himself. In his own intellectual progress, he had united the various elements of theology in a comprehensive unity, according to the laws of his peculiar individuality. But this union, which in him was the product of his natural genius and his personal efforts, did not take place in all. In connexion with the great men, who are destined to occupy the central point of affairs, there are always a multitude on the circumference and within the circle, who, though they are attracted and influenced by the centre, yet follow only one side and direction, which is most in accordance with their nature, or of which they have first become masters, and in this manner lose the other directions, and finally their connexion with the central point itself. It happened so in the experience of

Schleiermacher. Many whom he had first won back to positive Christianity, or to whom he had revealed the deep fountain of religious life in immediate feeling, or to whom he had made plain and delightful the strict coherence and actual truth in the spirit of the doctrine of the church, were so strongly acted upon by this, as to overlook and lose the other side, — that of criticism, — which, from the central point in which he lived, he retained with equal strength and love, — and perhaps in the end they became estranged, and regarded this side with hostility. It is worthy of remark, as a testimony to the Christian vitality of his teaching, that, among those who were chiefly attracted by the critical side of his theology, and who pursued it to a greater length than himself, there was scarcely one, who did not at the same time retain and cherish the positive element which related to religion and the church. But as Schleiermacher, from the living centre on which he stood, could not fail to perceive the partial and exclusive directions of the day, — and whenever they threatened to obtain a preponderance, held it his duty to contend against them, by indirectly adding to the weight of the opposite side, if not in a still more direct manner, — it was very natural, that whoever saw him contending with decision and zeal in this direction, especially if he himself was made to feel the force of his blows, should imagine, that he stood in hostility to the very truth, which he had been in the habit of defending. In this way, misunderstandings, open and concealed enmities, and discords arose in the midst of those who had once been attached to him. His own words on this point are very characteristic: "As soon as a partial tendency appears unduly predominant, it is my way, whether you call it good or bad, in fear lest the vessel in which we all sail should overset, to throw my feeble influence as much as possible on the opposite side." Even this harmless expression of truth and love, in the spirit of moderation and caution, has been misunderstood and decried, as a manifest proof of inward indecision and doubt, by those who see only the germs of corruption in the different directions of the age, and who regard the opposing elements, which they angrily contest, as nothing but untruth, and revolt from Christianity. With this spirit of presumption and arrogance Schleiermacher had not the slightest sympathy. With the weighty influence, which he brought on every side which he undertook to defend, he never forgot the central point of a truly progressive theology, and one

which should combine all the elements of Christian life and thought. As often as he might engage in combat in different directions, he always returned with the deepest interest to this point, as his appropriate station, and never deserted the fountain of life in the Gospel of Christ. He had only two enemies, against which he always cherished a mortal hostility. These were the bondage of the letter, which interfered with the rights of freedom, and the superficial frivolity, which denied the eternal truth of the Gospel.

We will now direct our attention to the influence of Schleiermacher in the field of scientific and practical theology, as exerted in his writings which relate to this department. It is proper to begin with his celebrated "Discourses on Religion, addressed to the Educated among its Despisers,"* a work which has reaped a large harvest of censure and commendation. This first appeared in 1799, and afterward in 1806 and 1821, the third time with copious notes of illustration and defence. In some respects, this work belongs entirely to the period in which it arose. It bears the impress of the condition of society in which it was written. This was at a time when it was regarded as a proof of refinement and talent to contend against religion, especially against the positive revelations of Christianity. At best, it was recommended as a useful restraint upon the mass of the people, rather than as the necessary ground of all genuine human cultivation. The prevailing theological systems, — both the orthodox and the heterodox, — were poorly qualified to destroy the frivolous prejudices of the age against religion. The established orthodoxy of the church was devoted to barren notions and formularies, which in the actual advancement of the times had lost their power and vitality. Heterodoxy, on the other hand, whether philosophical or historical and critical, was employed in the work of demolition. It was destitute of the living idea of religion, the high enthusiasm, the prophetic instinct, which urges on to the formation of a new and better order of things. It even tended, in some degree, to rob religion of its supremacy, to banish it

[* "Ueber die Religion. Reden an Gebildeten unter ihren Verächtern." The edition before us is the fourth. Berlin, 1831. Dr. Lücke omits to mention this. It is probably unchanged from the third, and in such case a new impression of a work is hardly counted as a new edition in Germany. — Tr.]

from the centre of life to the subordinate sphere of science, or of an independent, self-sufficient morality. These circumstances decided in general the object, subject matter, and tone of the "Discourses." Schleiermacher felt himself impelled to go forth, armed with the two-fold force of a fresh and youthful enthusiasm for religion, and an austere and vigorous logic, to the new discovery, as it were, and the conquest of the province of religion for cultivated minds; to exhibit it in its true original empire, in the full brightness of its power and beauty, free from the misunderstandings and perversions both of its enemies and its friends, and thus to enkindle a more glowing love towards it in all who were susceptible of its impressions. This appeared to him impossible without a brilliant and fearless eloquence. The style of his "Discourses" accordingly gained at least the admiration of his adversaries, and contributed in no small degree to excite an interest in his cause among many who were prejudiced against it. "They are compositions," said Frederic Schlegel at the time, "of the very highest order in their kind which we have in the German language; full of strength and fire, yet perfectly artist-like, and in their style worthy of one of the ancients."

The society in which Schleiermacher then lived brought him into intimate connexion with the fresh and perhaps somewhat too daring spirits, who announced and enforced their deep-rooted hostility to the wretched meagreness and degradation of the age, by bold and vigorous attacks in the pages of the "Athenæum." This partly accounts for the polemic form, the fearless and militant tone of the "Discourses," which gave as much offence to the professedly prudent and cautious, as delight to the more ardent minds of the young. But, whether repulsive or attractive, they were in the highest degree exciting to all classes. The mode in which Schleiermacher conceived and exhibited the essential nature of religion was certainly the result of his own previous cultivation, the genuine copy of his own individuality. A man who was conscious to himself of possessing religion in the lowest depths of his spirit, as the most sacred altar-fire of his life, prior to all action and to all the speculations of science, as the deeper fountain of both, could never regard it either as the product or as the helpful completion of knowledge or action. He accordingly referred its primitive and essential seat to feeling, as the burning focus, the inmost root of spiritual life. In order to recognise

every thing which is really religion among men, and to admit even the lowest degrees of it into the idea of religion, he wished to make this as broad and comprehensive in its character as possible. But as he was conscious at the same time, that he possessed religion in its genuine and positive nature only as a Christian and in connexion with the Christian church, he felt bound also to show, that all religion in the human soul depended for its vitality and effects on positive institutions and social relations. The "Discourses" clearly evince the influence of his early studies in the systems of Plato, Spinoza, Kant, Jacobi, and Fichte; but these aided him merely by suggestion and impulse to attain the consciousness of his own individuality. Whoever reads them with attention and without prejudice will perceive, that, in his conceptions of religion, he was not a servile follower of any one of those philosophers, but on the contrary that he was completely and absolutely himself, and this with his soul firmly rooted in Christianity. The accusation of Pantheism has been urged against him, principally on account of these "Discourses," often in a thoughtless spirit, but sometimes with reflection and seriousness. The appearance, nay, perhaps here and there a decided expression, is against him. But he only who overlooks the peculiar object and position of the "Discourses" in relation to their times, and confounds their merely external and adventitious details with their central principles; who regards as Pantheism every profound and inward apprehension of the indissoluble connexion between God and the universe, which exists in the religious nature, and prefers every chilling and mechanical view of the world as destitute of the agency of the living God to any softening and enlargement of his rigid and exclusive notions, can believe that Pantheism was Schleiermacher's genuine and permanent opinion. At least, after what he has said himself in explanation of this subject in the third edition, it is impossible to repeat the charge without wilful unkindness. The "Discourses" certainly belong to an early period in his culture and progress, and must be explained accordingly. After his work on Doctrinal Theology, he could not have written the "Discourses," or at any rate he would have written them in a different manner. They are defences of religion in general, rather than of Christianity in particular, announced in the outer court of theology, or, I might almost say, in the court of the Gentiles; but yet they clearly contain the peculiar tendencies and essential principles upon which

his whole system of theology depends. This explains the fact that when, in the year 1821, he was compelled by the wishes of the public to undertake a new edition of the work, he found it necessary, in comparing his youthful labor with the Christian system of his riper years, to introduce certain explanatory modifications, but to make no essential changes or omissions.

Until the year 1804, he was known as a learned theologian only within a limited sphere. But immediately after his entrance as a public teacher of theology, during this year, at Halle, his lectures attracted attention and soon excited the most devoted enthusiasm in the minds of his youthful and susceptible audience. I well remember the glowing interest with which my elder schoolfellows, as they returned from Halle, spoke of the new light which had arisen upon them in Schleiermacher. The course of his education and his personal taste tended to give him a decided preference, in addition to systematic and practical theology, for the interpretation and criticism of the New Testament. On this subject he had engaged in profound and comprehensive studies, but without doubt more in the department of Greek, as connected with Christianity, than in that of Hebrew and the Old Testament. He was no stranger to what is called erudition, in the rigid sense of the term; but, as he once sportively remarked to me, "those who looked for literary notices from him would be disappointed." He read with care whatever pertained to his department, but more with a view to selecting than amassing materials. His natural genius led him to the investigation of fundamental principles, and at the same time to the selection of appropriate forms for their representation. In every subject to which he directed his attention, he sought, after the manner of Plato, the central idea, the vital and systematic connexion of the whole; and, having succeeded in this, he aimed to express it in a form of the greatest fitness, purity, and strength. Hence his style of composition in the province of scientific theology was, from the time of his earliest efforts, artist-like, graceful, and free from the need and the embarrassment of learned quotations.

In this style his "Critical Letter on the First Epistle to Timothy"* was written, in the year 1807. By this first

[* "Ueber den sogenannten ersten Brief des Paulus an den Timotheus. Ein Kritisches Sendschreiben an J. C. Gass. Berlin, 1807."– Tr.]

essay of his theological learning, he made himself known to the learned theological world, and even to that portion of it which had given no special attention to his "Discourses on Religion." This first essay displayed the hand of a master. Since the time of Semler, the historical criticism of the Canon had been exercised with great freedom. The critical difficulties of this Epistle, especially in its historical relations, had been already noticed, and Schmidt of Giessen had not hesitated at least to suggest doubts as to its genuineness. But yet Schleiermacher's "Letter" was new and unique in its kind. It may be regarded as the first introduction of the higher criticism, which masters like Bentley had employed in classical learning, into the province of the literature of the New Testament. It had hitherto been the custom among theologians to apply critical doubts to those writings only, which in the primitive church had borne the character, to a greater or less degree, of *Antilegomena*. But where the early testimony of the church had been unanimous in favor of the genuineness of any portion of Scripture, as was the case with this Epistle, even the school of Semler did not venture to suggest any doubts. The historical and exegetical difficulties of this Epistle were removed by recourse to hypothesis rather than to suspicion. But Schleiermacher hazarded the experiment of a bolder and more thorough-going criticism. He did not condescend to make use of the aid which could be afforded by the absence of the Pastoral Letters from the Canon of Marcion. As his suspicions were first excited by a systematic study of the Epistles of Paul, and by entering with his whole soul into his peculiar style of thinking, he derived his proof against the genuineness of this Epistle from internal grounds, from the discrepancy of its ideas and composition compared with those of Paul, from the want of connexion, of clearness, and of adaptation in its historical relations, and from its suspicious affinity with the two other Pastoral Letters as a compilation from their contents. The criticism is conducted with so much acuteness, the style is so truly luminous and attractive, that whoever gives himself up even in a small degree to the first impression, will almost involuntarily be convinced. Upon a closer examination, however, the weakness of certain arguments as well as the rashness of individual assertions, becomes apparent. We grow suspicious of a criticism which treats the Epistles of Paul as classical writings, which assumes a complete and well-known type

in his epistolary style, and, with such defects in our information, regards his historical circumstances as forming an entire whole with which we can be perfectly acquainted. Still, although the younger Planck and others* have succeeded in bringing many grounds for the vindication of this Epistle against the attacks of Schleiermacher, his arguments have by no means been entirely set aside; and the faith of the church in its genuineness has received a wound, which, notwithstanding all the remedies that have hitherto been applied, cannot be said to be yet completely healed. But, with all the boldness of his criticism, Schleiermacher does not pass the bounds of moderation. When Eichhorn afterwards rejected all three of the Pastoral Letters as spurious, I remember hearing Schleiermacher say, that this seemed to him to be going too far, and that any one who rejected the two other Pastoral Letters, renounced the true and legitimate ground for the criticism of the first. Whatever estimate we may form of the validity and the result of this attempt of Schleiermacher, it is certain that we cannot point out a specimen of criticism on the New Testament which displays higher genius in the conception, or more admirable skill in the execution. I have heard students of classical philology envy us this production. The conjectural criticism which has been excited among us principally by this

---

[* The genuineness of this Epistle was ably defended against the objections of Schleiermacher in a small treatise, entitled "Specimen observationum crit. exeget. de vocabulis ἅπαξ λεγομένοις, et rar. dic. formulis in prima ad Tim. ep. Pauli obviis authentiæ ejus nihil detrahentibus. Auct. J. T. Beckhaus, 1810."

A more complete work is that alluded to in the text. by Planck, entitled "Bemerkungen über den ersten Paulinischen Brief an den Timotheus, in Beziehung auf das Kritische Sendschreiben des Prof. Schleiermacher. Von H. Planck, 1808."

He was followed by Wegscheider, who also maintains the genuineness of the Epistle in his work entitled "Die Pastoralbriefe des Apostels Paulus. 1810."

It was subsequently attacked with great vigor by Eichhorn in his "Introduction to the New Testament," and vindicated by Bertholdt (Einleitung in das N. T., 6 Theil.), who closes his argument with saying, "that the genuineness of this Epistle may be confidently maintained against the objections of Schleiermacher and Eichhorn, without the slightest reserve or limitation." De Wette, on the other hand, one of the latest writers on the Introduction to the New Testament, and of a most fastidious judgment in matters of historical evidence, takes side with Schleiermacher and Eichhorn against the Epistle. — Tr.]

"Letter" is certainly hazardous, and least of all should be entrusted in the hands of every one. But it belongs to the completion of a scientific theory of the Canon; and, as there is no reason for deeming it less necessary in theology than in classical literature, we must allow Schleiermacher the well-founded merit of its introduction.

The historical criticism of the Christian Canon continued to be a favorite pursuit with him. In his exegetical lectures there may yet lie concealed many critical hints, many critical questions and answers, similar to his Treatise on "the Testimony of Papias concerning the first two Gospels."* He subsequently appeared as an author in this department in his "Critical Essay on the Writings of Luke, 1817,"† with reference to the difficult problem of the origin of the synoptical Gospels.

It is known that, particularly since the time of Lessing, a multitude of hypotheses have almost exhausted this problem, but it has not yet been solved. On the contrary, it has become still more intricate and dark. Schleiermacher, in accordance with Dr. Gieseler, restored the course of investigation from the airy regions into which it had been led by Eichhorn's hypothesis of a primitive Gospel, to the solid ground of history and exegesis. His hypothesis is equally simple and probable in an historical point of view. He supposes that our present Gospels are to be regarded as compilations, independent of each other, from various evangelical *Memorabilia* of a greater or less extent, that were previously in circulation. He attempts to verify this hypothesis by applying it to the Gospel of Luke. By a profound investigation of the structure of this Gospel, and by a comparison of it with the two others, he endeavours with singular acuteness to ascertain the documents on which it is founded, in their original form, and to determine the manner in which Luke conducted his compilation and arrangement. The authority of the sacred writings has only gained by this, not merely because it must always gain by the discovery of truth, but because the value of the sources to which Luke had access, and his fidelity in the use of them, is estab-

---

[* "Ueber die Zeugnisse des Papias von unsern beiden ersten Evangelien." In the "Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1832." Part II. p. 733. — Tr.]

[† "Ein Krit. Versuch. Ueber die Schriften des Lukas." — Tr.]

lished in a clearer light by Schleiermacher's "Essay." It has been objected to it, especially to that part which treats of the connexion between the documents and their original forms, that it is often more acute than probable. But it arose, partly from the mode of investigation which Schleiermacher adopted, partly from the very nature of a first attempt of this kind, that the theory should be carried with the most sagacious criticism to its extreme limits. It is a great advantage of such subtile investigations, that we learn from them distinctly how far we can go. This is always an essential benefit. A critical process, carried on in the method of Schleiermacher, with reference to the two other Gospels, would unquestionably lead to many modifications, limitations, and corrections. It is only by uniting the comparative consideration of the Gospels with the investigation of the individual manner of each Evangelist, that the critical problem of the Gospels will be solved to the satisfaction of science and the church. But even if we shall hereafter be compelled to strike out other paths which truth shall oblige us to follow, the great merits of Schleiermacher in contributing such essential aid to the progress of the investigation will always be remembered with gratitude.

The works on the First Epistle to Timothy and the Gospel of Luke, on account of the natural connexion between criticism and exegesis, contain also specimens of Schleiermacher's exegetical method, but generally of merely an occasional character. Whoever has had the privilege of hearing his exegetical lectures will be able to give a better description of his merits in this department than I can myself. With the exception of some occasional specimens, I am acquainted with them only from his exegetical discussion of Col. i. 13 – 20,* and from the accounts which I have received from his hearers. The image which I have formed of them is this. Schleiermacher knew of no other mode of interpreting the sacred writings than that in which philological taste and skill, and a living interest in the Canon, as the original and authoritative exhibition of Christianity, are united in the most intimate relations. He expressly declares in his "Survey of Theological Study," that exegesis, without a genuine interest in Christianity, is as vain and worthless as without a true philological spirit.

[* "Studien und Kritiken, 1832," pp. 497. — Tr.]

The object of all interpretation, according to his views of it, is to comprehend correctly every individual thought in its relation to the pervading idea of the whole, and thus to reconstruct the original composition. Now as he aimed above all things to solve this leading problem in the genuine spirit of philology, he paid little or no attention in his exegetical process to the discussion of the grammatical and historical elements of the solution; but while, for the sake of not distracting the attention, he presupposed them to a greater or less degree as already known, or merely touched upon them so far as they were essential to the success of the operation, he proceeded directly to the construction and exhibition of the fundamental thoughts and their systematic connexion. For the most part, he undertook this construction with reference merely to its scientific form. The ascetic, apologetic, and dogmatic application of the thoughts of the writer he reserved for more befitting occasions. In this regard his Sermons are highly important, as completing the process of interpretation in its more practical and popular relations. They form a rich treasure of exegetical developements.

His scientific interpretation was preëminently logical, and depended on the supposition of rigid laws of thought and composition in the author. In this department of the art he was distinguished as a genuine master. The process of interpretation requires two equally essential directions of the mind, which apparently exclude each other, but which in fact are inseparable. These may be called the direction of abandonment, and of appropriation. I understand by the first, the absolute yielding of the mind, the immersion, as it were, into the peculiar spirit and conceptions of the writer. There is required for this, in a certain degree, the renunciation and surrendry of self, like that which takes place in the exercise of friendship. This is the first essential condition of all true insight, which gains in clearness and reality in proportion as the interpreter forgets his own individuality, and the circumstances and associations of his age. But this self-oblivion for the purposes of interpretation, like that in a moral point of view, is not the actual abandonment of our own proper self, but only its extension and enlargement. Unless the surrendry of ourselves to the author is at the same time an active apprehension, a genuine reception of another's mind into our own, a personal, individual appropriation, it will be unfruitful, because it

is more or less destitute of consciousness or intellectual action. The process of interpretation is completed, then, by personal appropriation, the translation of the author's conceptions into our own. This perfect solution of the problem of exegesis can be attained by no single individual. Even in the most self-surrendering interpreter, there will always be some remains of his own individuality, by which the pure apprehension of the mind of the author will be impaired. But he who merely yields up his own mind, without an active appropriation of the conceptions of the author, will to a greater or less degree be destitute of the power of interpreting or communicating the intelligence, which he has received, to the minds of others.

The gifts of interpretation are unequally shared. Schleiermacher is among those whose power of appropriation is greater than that of surrendry, who are more inclined to draw the author over to themselves than to yield their own minds to his. This mode if it does not exclude the other, has its validity as well as its advantages. The prevalence of the spirit of the New Testament, by means of correct original and individual conceptions in various forms, increases the just understanding of its contents and its personal and practical influence, within the pale of the church. In this respect it must be allowed that Schleiermacher, through the freshness and originality of his conceptions, has rendered an important service in aid of exegetical science. But the very strength of his individuality, which imprinted itself upon every thing which came within his sphere, prevented him from yielding his mind with the self-oblivion that is necessary in order to reproduce the sense of another in its original form.

Among the New Testament writers, there was none with whom he had a greater personal affinity than Paul; he loved him above all the others. On this account he has done more for the elucidation of his writings than of any other of the sacred writers. But as it often happens with the love exercised by commanding characters, Schleiermacher insensibly transformed the Apostle into himself. He made him reason with logical precision as well as write with rhetorical skill. While he saw himself in Paul rather than Paul in himself, it is certain, that, with all his rare sagacity and almost magical power in his exegetical reasonings and statements, he presented an interpretation of himself rather than of the Apostle. But this cannot

prevent us from attaching a high value to his services in exegetical theology ; since, even in the very instances in which the ascendency of his own mind led him to err, he was able to awaken a greater degree of life and of scientific activity, in this sphere of exertion, than a hundred ordinary individuals, whose want of a strong and original character renders them incapable of ever making a mistake.

An important epoch in Schleiermacher's theological career was formed by the establishment of the Berlin University, in the year 1810. I do not know what part he took in the founding of it. His able treatise on Universities could not have been without influence in this respect. But this I know, that Berlin designates a new period in theology, as Halle had done a century before, and that it could not have been a matter of accident, but grew out of the position of affairs at that time, that Schleiermacher, from the very beginning, appeared at the head of the theological faculty in the new University, as Savigny at the head of the juridical department. The spirit of the new University, in relation to theology, was designated, soon after its establishment, by Schleiermacher's "Brief Exposition of a course of Theological Study." * Only a few pages, but a whole world of new ideas! The Method of theological study, a science which had its origin in the peculiar structure of the German mind, had been already treated very advantageously by Nösselt, Planck, and Kleucker, according to the academical course which then prevailed in Germany. But Schleiermacher left his nearest predecessors far behind him. Theology appeared with him, for the first time, as an organic whole, constructed with admirable architectural power, from its practical foundation, — the want of a legitimate administration of the Christian church, and the intimate connexion of the theologian with its interests, — to its practical summit, — the theory and art of ecclesiastical practice. Recognising with strict impartiality all the essential elements of theology, the religious and scientific, the practical and theoretical, the positive and philosophical, — separating, combining, and arranging, according to the exigencies of the case, — with masterly skill, Schleiermacher erects a magnificent edifice, reposing upon a solid foundation, and orderly and complete in all its proportions.

---

* "Kurtze Darstellung des Theologischen Studiums zum Behuf einleitender Vorlesungen."

With its simple arrangement no one can experience any embarrassment; every theological interest and talent finds its place and its employment; every thing is fused and blended in a living union; no one can be idle; only the slothful and unscientific are excluded, and that without an express rejection. We hardly know which to admire the most in this composition, the vastness of the design, or the originality and boldness of the execution. The plan had its origin entirely in the mind of Schleiermacher; the state of theology at that time presented only certain general outlines and relations, of which he could make any use, and these he was obliged to employ in a different connexion and arrangement. The grand conception of theology, with which Schleiermacher was inspired, had no corresponding reality at that time; and hence his "Exposition" contains rather a theology of the future than of the present. In this sense it may be regarded as a genuine prophetic work, which, in the living progress of our science and church, will more and more receive its fulfilment. If I were called upon to point out in detail what is new in this writing, and the most important benefits that may be derived from it, I should refer partly to the intimate connexion which it establishes between theological science and the idea of the church, by which the positive and practical purpose, and the moral and religious interest, of theology are defined; partly to the destination and position of philosophic theology at the very entrance of theological study, whereby the ancient controversy on the relation of philosophy to theology is settled in a simple way; partly to the peculiar union of the exegetical, ecclesiastical, and systematic elements under the common category of historical theology, whereby the injurious division of these departments is avoided, and particularly the confounding of dogmatics with the philosophy of religion, of theological ethics with philosophical, which so often occurs in the province of systematic theology, is wholly prevented; partly to the magnificent style in which practical theology is constructed as an organic whole, and introduced into the idea of theology as an integral part, or rather regarded as its consummation and crown; partly, in fine, as it respects the scientific method, to the radical distinction between the general attainments in theology, without which no one can be a theologian, and the rare accomplishments, which are essential to the successful activity of an academical teacher.

An objection has been brought to this "Exposition," on account of its epigrammatical conciseness. But it was intended to contain merely general propositions, which only masters in the science can understand without further explication. And, although I could wish myself, that the new edition of 1830 had contained a greater number of illustrations, I must own, that the form of brief, even of enigmatical propositions, appears to me incomparably better adapted for an academical compend, than the fulness of detail which rather destroys than awakens the need of explanatory lectures. In this respect, the form of Schleiermacher's "Exposition" seems to me to be truly admirable.

Among the fruitful treasures of this work, I should number also the peculiar manner in which systematic theology, including dogmatics, ethics, and ecclesiastical statistics, is represented in its relation to the present condition of the church, as an integral and complemental portion of historical theology, of which, according to Schleiermacher's opinion, exegesis may be regarded as the beginning, and ecclesiastical history, in the strict sense of the term, as the middle point. In this, I am aware, that many and perhaps most will differ from me. But I am myself among those who do not unconditionally approve of Schleiermacher's representation of systematic theology in this respect. It is my opinion, that the scientific interest, which is at the foundation of systematic theology, is far greater than the historical, even if the critical is included with it. This is the systematic, and by no means the subordinate, interest of arranging materials presented in history into a finished whole, — but the interest of representing the principles of the Christian faith and practice in their absolute truth with such scientific clearness, that every doubt and contradiction, as well as all internal inconsistency, may be banished from the province of Christian thought. This is an entirely different interest from the historical. But I must nevertheless insist, that by the great prominence which Schleiermacher gave to the positive and historical element in systematic theology, by his lucid exposition of its peculiar nature and object in the cultivated religious consciousness, and the doctrinal system of the church, and by his suppression of arbitrary hypothesis and individual speculation, he has performed an essential service, which will be gratefully acknowledged by posterity, if not by ourselves. This leads me to the great work in which he has carried out

his view of systematic theology, and which forms the close, or, I may call it, the crown of his literary and theological activity on earth, — "The Doctrines of Christian Faith, according to the Principles of the Evangelical Church," 1821, 1822; — second edition, 1830, 1831.*

With the diversity of opinions and feelings in this province, it may not be easy to convince every one, that this work commences a new period, a true reformation in the literature of doctrinal theology. I know of no work which I can place by its side in historical significance, except the *Institutio Religionis Christianæ* of John Calvin, at the time of its appearance. Even its adversaries have given their testimony to its exciting and powerful effects, by the earnest opposition which they have directed against it. The time will come when other doctrinal developements, which introduce new epochs, will consign those which are presented in this work of Schleiermacher to comparative oblivion; but, as long as the science of theology retains life, the time will never come, when it will cease to be regarded as one of those commanding and almost prophetic points of elevation, from which new prospects are obtained, and new paths to the attainment of the object discovered. The dialectic skill which pervades the work has been admired by many who knew not what they admired, and by many in rather an ambiguous manner, with a secret shudder and well-timed dismay, which they supposed would release them from the labor and toil of its scientific study. But in every branch of knowledge it is a joyful and encouraging event, when a gifted mind brings it nearer to the character of rigid science, and reduces it under the authority of a stricter method and arrangement, of greater precision of ideas, and a more exact and systematic connexion. This has been done, to a certain degree, by Schleiermacher in the science of doctrinal theology. His merit in this respect is enhanced by the consideration, that his dialectic power, in a manner that is any thing but scholastic and dry, with the freedom and freshness of life, has overcome the prevailing affectation of a popular style and the merely external logical method, as well as the faint-hearted despair of attaining a scientific form, and by the

* "Die Christliche Glaube, nach den Grundsätzen der Evangelischen Kirche in Zusammenhange dargestellt."

force of his own example has given them an effectual contradiction.

But this is not the only nor the greatest merit of Schleiermacher's work. This consists in its peculiar substance and character, — in the fact, that he has given such decided prominence, from beginning to end, to the positive nature of the doctrines of Christian faith, to their most profound significance, and their relation to the life of religion and of the church. With all his individuality, acuteness, and sincerity in the subjective point of view which he adopted, he has contributed incomparably more to reinstate the objective and eternal truth of the Christian faith in the convictions of scientific minds, than those who, priding themselves on the possession of purely objective and absolute truth, as it is seen by the Deity himself, look down contemptuously on the theologian, who takes his stand in subjective feeling, as on a lower degree of progress, which they have long since surmounted. Dr. Twesten says, with great justice, "that Schleiermacher, in recalling the doctrines of faith to the facts of Christian consciousness, as their primary foundation and their genuine object, has not only restored to them their independence, but secured faith itself from the attacks of a science which is ignorant of its legitimate boundaries." * This merit will be gratefully ascribed to him by the latest posterity; and it would not be surprising, if, after the intoxication of the modern absolute philosophy has been succeeded by a period of meagre skepticism, the principal weapons against it should be borrowed from the armoury of Schleiermacher.

It may be objected to this work, that its exegetical foundation has not sufficient breadth and completeness, and that the Christian consciousness is not distinctly embraced in its original and legitimate form. But this is inseparable from one of its peculiar merits, namely, that Schleiermacher did not regard the essential substance of Christian faith as a sealed letter, but as a free product of the mind, fully unfolded, and diffused through the whole historical life of the church. He abides firmly by the pure fountain in the life and teachings of the Redeemer; he will acknowledge nothing which does not flow from that source; but, while he is convinced of the unceasing

[* "Twesten's Vorlesungen über die Dogmatik," 1829, p. 256, note. — Tr.]

agency of the spirit of Christ in the church, which illustrates his word and his history, he assumes with a liberal confidence, that exactly that which has prevailed as Christianity in the consciousness of the church, is genuine Christian truth. Dr. Twesten celebrates, "as one of the most beautiful traits in this masterly performance, that magnanimous tolerance which was able to rise above contending opinions, and, without overlooking them, to point out how Christian consciousness could proportionally express itself in all of them." I would not only copy these words, but yield them my entire and hearty accordance. The time has already come, when a louder and louder call is heard from the Protestant church for the exercise of a magnanimous tolerance, like that which Schleiermacher displayed in his "Doctrines of the Christian Faith." It is demanded as a solemn obligation in behalf of the Christian community, as the only means of preservation against the growing spirit of obstinacy, division, and exclusiveness, which prevails in the contests of theological sects, and which threatens to destroy the church of Christ. A charge has indeed been brought against the work on this very account. It has been said, that it makes the pale of Christianity too wide, — that, while it enlarges the fellowship of Christian love, it enervates the power of Christian truth. But this can be alleged only by those who are unable to make the distinction between toleration and indifference. He who, like Schleiermacher in this work, so firmly retains the peculiar antithesis between grace and sin; who insists so strenuously on the absolute need of the divine grace in Jesus Christ; who gives such well-defined prominence to the historical and living Christ in his perfect sinlessness and unparalleled character, and makes him the central point of his faith; who rejects so unreservedly and consistently the heretical errors of the Ebionites and Docetæ, of the Manichæans and Pelagians; who so clearly comprehends and carries out the principles of Protestanism without calling in question the element of truth possessed by Catholicism, — he can be charged with indifference, only by the most wretched intolerance, the most pitiable bondage to the letter. If the deistical Rationalism of the earlier schools of theology has ever suffered prostration, it has suffered it from this very work. Much that professes to be a decided victory over it, it could have overcome; but it will never recover from the deadly wound which

has been inflicted upon it by the truly rational, but not *rationalistic* Dogmatics of Schleiermacher.*

He was not one of those selfish individuals, who wish that every new movement in science should commence with themselves. He gladly went back for instruction to the earlier developements in theology, and made them the starting-point for his own views. This historical interest explains the use made in his Dogmatics of the earlier doctrinal decisions of celebrated teachers in the Latin and Greek churches. He was careful to

---

[* The effect of Schleiermacher's great work is visible in the productions of almost every recent theological writer in Germany. It has given an impulse to the science, which can be compared to nothing with more correctness, than to that which was received by philosophy from the influence of Kant's "Critique of Pure Reason." Still, it appears to us, that Dr. Lücke's statements in this connexion are too highly colored. It is true, that Rationalism has lost its hold of a great proportion of the younger German theologians, and that no one has recently signalized himself in its defence. But with the authority of such men as Paulus in the interpretation of the New Testament, Wegscheider in systematic theology, Krug in philosophy, Gesenius in criticism and philology, and Dr. Röhr, one of the most powerful living preachers in Germany, in pulpit eloquence, it does not give a fair impression to speak of Rationalism as being dead, or suffering from a mortal wound. Still further, when many of the most important results of Rationalism are adopted even by Dr. Lücke himself, it would have been better to say, that Rationalism is inspired with a new life, brought nearer to the dictates of Christian consciousness, and absorbed, as it were, into a system of scientific Supernaturalism, and fructified thereby, than to represent it as about to be discarded and forgotten. At any rate, it is certain, that the influence of such men as the conductors of the "Evangelical Church Journal," about whom so much has been said in this country, unwisely and not well, as the restorers of a purer form of Christianity, is a mere bubble in the great current of thought, as it is now strongly setting among the theologians of Germany. Harms of Kiel, one of the principal agitators in the new backward movement, appears to be a mere boisterous fanatic; and though Hahn, late of Leipsic, now of Breslau, Hengstenberg of Berlin, and Olshausen of Königsberg, are men of higher pretensions, and in scientific culture far in advance of any of their party, there is no indication, that they will succeed in the design of reinstating the ancient Orthodoxy in the Evangelical church. The whole school of Schleiermacher, with De Wette now at their head, and, with his noble character and admirable attainments, a host in himself, are heartily opposed to this tendency, and have too much strength to permit its prevalence, at least in the present generation. The blessings of freedom and light are too highly valued to allow the revival of the spirit of the dark ages. — Tr.]

gather all the grains of gold in their writings; and to this tendency we are partly indebted for two of his most effective productions in the province of dogmatic history, — one on "The Theory of Augustine and Calvin on the Doctrine of Election," with which the Berlin Theological Journal commences, and the other on "The Opposition between the Sabellian and Athanasian Conceptions of the Trinity," which signalizes the close of that work. Each of these treatises manifests the peculiar talent of Schleiermacher, which had been cultivated and distinguished in his personal investigations on the history of the Greek philosophy. We owe to the second treatise many new points of view, in regard to the history of the doctrine of the Trinity in its gradual formation and systematic connexion. The first treatise is apparently ill-timed, since, by defending the logical consistency of the Augustinian and Calvinistic doctrine of Election, it is more adapted to injure than to promote the union of the two Evangelical confessions, in the view of a great majority. But, when I suggested this to him, he explained his purpose of furthering this union by introducing a fresh discussion on a point which, to a superficial view, might seem to have been long since exhausted, but which, if the union was to be completed with reference to the developement of a scientific theology, must sooner or later be made a question. It is the merit of this treatise, that it has excited a more thorough and accurate discussion of this difficult problem, and has given a new direction to the doctrinal decisions on the subject.

It was not merely as an author that Schleiermacher exerted an influence on the reform and progress of theology. As an academic teacher by means of oral instruction, he has struck out many new paths and opened new points of view. After the publication of a part of his lectures, we shall be able to form a more accurate idea of his services in this respect. His lectures on the "Life of Jesus" have since occasioned a similar course at other Universities. The work of Hase on this subject, which, with all its defects, has great merit, was first suggested by Schleiermacher. Of these lectures I can only say, that when they appear, on account of his peculiar mode of treating the subject, they will present many original and quickening views, both in relation to the interpretation of the Gospels, and to the doctrinal and ethical consideration of the character of Christ. In like manner practical theology, which

he regularly taught and always with the greatest freshness and life; ecclesiastical statistics, of which he first presented a scientific view; church history, and the critical introduction to the New Testament, which he occasionally taught, and enriched with original suggestions and ideas; finally, Christian ethics, on which he exerted a direct reforming influence as an author, in his "Critique of different Moral Systems," and his contributions to the Memoirs of the Academy of Sciences; all these departments will be indebted to his lectures for new tendencies and impulses, both among those to whom they were delivered, and those who are permitted only to read them.

Schleiermacher was master of theology as an organic whole. He did not regard it, however, merely in reference to his own personal and scientific wants, or to the perfection and brilliancy of his intellectual nature; but in its vital connexion with the administration of the Christian church, to which he felt that he had a peculiar call, both in the pulpit and in the professor's chair, as an officer of the church and a minister of the divine word. If the true theologian is formed by the mutual influence of the interests of science and the interests of the church, acting upon and pervading each other, Schleiermacher was certainly one in no common degree; since he possessed both elements in such rare perfection and such beautiful harmony, that he was equally qualified to serve the church both as a theoretical and practical theologian. I have often regarded him with wonder and almost with envy, when I have seen the admirable powers, which it pleased God to bestow upon him in the two directions of theological life, so opposed to each other. His scientific activity in the study and in the academical chair was crowned every Sunday by his preaching the Gospel in the pulpit; and during the whole week was constantly diversified with manifold official engagements in connexion with the church and his systematic instruction of the youth, who were under his pastoral charge. For any other person this would have been too much; some of these various duties must have suffered. Not so with Schleiermacher. I have never heard him complain, that his numerous official cares were burdensome, or that one injured another. On the contrary, he found refreshment and recreation in one for the performance of the others. When I add to this, that, employed as he was at all times with his abundant official labors and his fruitful activity as an author, he was always fresh and

ready for the enjoyment of social life in every circle, that he never carried into society the abstraction and restraint of the student, but was always the cheerful and animated companion, — I can find vent for my admiration of this great man only in the thought, that it pleased a benignant Providence to give him such wonderful endowments, and in rejoicing that he possessed the virtue to employ them with such faithful devotion, and manifest them in such befitting order and harmony.

The most prominent object in his activity as a clergyman, was his weekly preaching. This was the image, and at the same time the complement and perfection of his scientific activity. With regard to the connexion between his discourses and his system of dogmatics, it is certain, that, although he made great account of the difference, in point of form, between scientific lectures to an academic audience, and the popular exhibition of the Christian faith, he was so far from admitting any difference in point of substance, that it must be said his dogmatics are as essential to the complete and scientific understanding of his discourses, as these, on the other hand, are necessary to a comprehensive and intelligent study of his dogmatics. It is an entirely groundless suspicion, which has been expressed by some superficial or unfriendly individuals, that he was a different man in the pulpit, from what he was in the lecture-room and in his scientific writings. The same inward conviction and love with which in the pulpit he insisted on the positive contents of Scripture, and selected their living and central point, the Redeemer, as the Son of God, for the substance of his discourses, appear also in his dogmatics, in the midst of critical and logical discussions addressed to the understanding. In like manner, the freedom and spirituality with which in his dogmatics he always contends against the bondage of the letter, against the false allegorical mode of connecting the Old and New Testament, which has prevailed both among the Gnostics and Judaizing Christians, against the confounding of the essential with the unessential, — these are found also in his sermons, in which, with the lofty spirit of Luther, he demands of his hearers to bear the boldest announcement of acknowledged truth. I have already spoken of the rich treasures which his discourses contain for scientific exegesis, especially for that of the New Testament. Of the suspicious distinction between doctrinal and moral discourses, he knew nothing. As he admitted only a relative distinction between

the science of dogmatics and that of morals, and maintained in the most decided manner their intimate connexion and mutual dependence; he also set forth in his discourses, the vital influence of Christian theory and practice, of faith and of love, upon each other. I do not know a single sermon, which he has printed or delivered, in which we can complain of the preponderance, either of the doctrinal or practical point of view, or the want of their close and efficacious union.

It is well known, that Schleiermacher did not write out his discourses before preaching. Those which he printed were copied afterwards. Whenever I heard him, two of his young friends were always employed in taking down his discourse. Whoever was aware of that, felt a still greater admiration of his extraordinary endowments. The discourse did not indeed spring up in the pulpit for the first time, since he had the conception of it in his mind for many days previous, and allowed it to ripen until the moment of its utterance. But he wrote nothing down until Saturday evening, and then only the text and the theme, or at the utmost a brief sketch of the divisions of his discourse. Thus prepared he went into the pulpit. Here then arose his discourse, in respect to its form and execution, as the living product of his previous meditation, of the exciting influence of the assembled church, and of the constant command of his mind over the arrangement of his thoughts and language. Whoever was acquainted with these circumstances would remark in hearing him the gradual progress of the structure of his discourse, the quiet and deliberate manner, almost in the tones of ordinary conversation, with which he began to collect and set in order his thoughts; but then, after he had spoken for a short time, and, as it were, had thrown out and drawn together the net of his ideas, his discourse became more rapid, more vehement; and as he approached the close, poured forth a rich stream of arousing and quickening appeals. In this way I heard him every Sunday for many years. He was always equal to himself, and always attractive by means of his peculiar mode of handling his text, the originality and freshness of his thoughts, the harmony of his style, and the flow of his language. I have never heard that he contradicted himself or made a correction. If the hearer was not completely enchained by the thoughts, he would often have occasion to admire the skill with which, in a style that inclined to complicated sentences, he always selected

the right word, and even in the most entangled periods, never lost the thread, which conducted him safely to a happy termination. It is not every one who has this gift, — the ability to speak, without written preparation, in all situations and in every frame of mind, on all subjects of Christian faith and life, with equal fulness, clearness, and beauty. The substance of a discourse often suffers under a great fluency and command of language. A monotonous manner is thus easily formed, accustomed modes of thought quickly return, and other evils of a like nature take place, which attend the habit of extemporaneous speaking, unless managed by the most gifted minds. But there was not a trace of any of these evils in Schleiermacher. He had his own peculiar style, and his own circle of thought. But the richness of his mind, and the depth and fulness of his religious feelings, secured him against the usual disadvantages of extemporaneous speaking, and enabled the hearer to perceive in him the highest degree of pulpit eloquence, and to enjoy its ripe and beautiful products. When I once asked him by what means he had acquired this enviable art, he replied, "that he was convinced at a very early period of his ministry, that the highest form of preaching could never be attained in delivering a discourse from memory,* by which its original life would always be impaired; but that it was

[* It seems that the habit of reading discourses from the manuscript of the writer is seldom or never practised in the German pulpit. This imposes a great labor on the preacher, who is compelled to spend much time in committing words to memory. Reinhard, the celebrated court-preacher at Dresden, tells us, that it was his custom to devote the first part of the morning exclusively to this exercise. A great waste of time is caused in this way, and probably not much is gained in regard to the efficiency of preaching. The German sermons are formal, stately, and common-place, almost to a miracle, considering the character of the minds which produced them. Instead of meeting with original and awakening exhibitions of truth, profound discussions of morals, or eloquent and impressive appeals to the heart, it is rarely that we find aught but applications of a common text, which have the merit of ingenuity but not of strength, and a very mechanical arrangement of sundry thoughts, which nobody thinks of doubting or cares to hear enforced. This may partly be accounted for by the fact, that so much time is lost in committing discourses to memory, and that to ensure facility and success in this, a method of great order and exactness, but extremely uninviting, is usually adopted. It seems to be agreed upon by common consent, that no new or quickening ideas shall be introduced into the pulpit. These are reserved for other departments of intellectual labor. Schleiermacher was certainly a capital exception to

essential to address the audience with the freshness and vigor which could come only from a mind in bold and powerful action at the moment. In order to fit himself for this method, he began by not writing the conclusion of his discourse, and then proceeding backward step by step, as one lays aside a warm garment by degrees, he at last attained the most difficult point of not writing the commencement."

Whoever heard only a single discourse of Schleiermacher might fear that he would not be sufficiently popular, and perhaps not intelligible, for the uneducated in his congregation. But this fear would entirely vanish after hearing him for any length of time in succession. He demanded much of his hearers, to be sure, but in fact nothing more than a familiar acquaintance with the Scriptures and close attention. Since he had the power of commanding this, even among the less educated, by the freshness and animation of his delivery, by the constant reference of the most profound religious ideas to practical life, to the circumstances of the church, the family, and the country, — we can easily understand, that, although his congregation consisted for the most part of cultivated persons, many individuals of an inferior class were accustomed to frequent his preaching, and listen to it with the utmost attention. I believe that this portion of his audience was constantly increasing, since, as he advanced with a living progress in his whole system of theology, his style of preaching, with the growing experience and enlargement of his inward life, gained,

---

these remarks. He adopted a wise course in discarding the shackles of *memoriter* preaching, and addressing his audience from the fulness of his own fruitful and systematic mind. The consequence is, that his sermons present no traces of the faults, to which we have alluded. They are, to be sure, rather treatises on religious philosophy, than glowing and practical appeals to the hearts of a Christian assembly. But they are any thing but formal or common-place. They give no idea of the meagre and languid style of discussion which prevails with many who are reputed to be great masters of pulpit eloquence in Germany. They are a rich mine of thought, in which we discover not merely scattered grains of gold, but thick masses. Neither the published discourses of Schleiermacher, however, nor those of any preacher, which have fallen under our eye, contain specimens of pulpit eloquence, which, for soundness and fertility of thought, fervor of Christian feeling, and beauty and richness of expression, can be compared with the first volume of Buckminster's Sermons, or with many others, which delicacy to the living will not allow us to name. — Tr.]

with every year of his ministry, in Christian simplicity and heartfelt conviction.

The sermon was undoubtedly the principal object with Schleiermacher, in his activity as a pastor. But, according to his custom of embracing every thing which belonged to a specific department of action, he attended with equal fidelity and love to every thing which pertained to the interests of the church. Before the need of a reformed Liturgy for public worship had been generally discussed, he attempted in his own congregation to awaken and satisfy a desire for improvement in this respect, as far as was possible in his own sphere, without a general reform in the whole Evangelical church. As he regarded the hymn and the sermon as a living whole, and the hymn-book then in use not being adapted to the arrangement of such a whole, he undertook to provide particular hymns, at least for the morning service, which he selected with great judgment and taste, from the treasures of our church, both of ancient and modern times. His congregation in this way gradually became acquainted with the most beautiful hymns, while he himself acquired the qualifications which fitted him to take a leading part in the work of a new hymn-book, which should be adapted to the present advanced state of Christian cultivation. It is well known how he became one of the principal editors of the new Berlin hymn-book. His vindication of that work is a testimony to the clearness, precision, and experience of his mind, even in this department.

Of his mode of proceeding in the religious instruction of the young, I have no immediate knowledge. I only know, that his instructions previous to confirmation were highly valued, and that the young persons of both sexes, whom he prepared and admitted to this rite, were always warmly and faithfully attached to him. This would have been impossible, if he had not possessed a peculiar talent of awakening an interest in the truths of the Gospel in the hearts of the young. The circle of youth whom he thus formed for himself, it appears to me, was the principal object in the more private relations of his pastoral care. He did not, indeed, withdraw himself from this essential branch of the duties of his office. But, partly on account of his peculiar situation and partly of his personal inclination, it was his habit, as a pastor, to be visited by those whose feeling of interest and confidence led them to him, rather than to seek them at their homes. Whatever influence he

might lose in this department of his official labors was supplied, in a great degree, by the unceasing and active concern which he took in the general interests of the church.

It is impossible for me to speak of the theological merits of Schleiermacher, without recalling the loveliness and elevation of his personal character. I learned to love the man at the same time that I became acquainted with his theology. The one sustained and illustrated the other. If I now attempt to portray some of the principal features in the image of his personal character, which remains in my mind, I am perfectly aware that I do not possess the skill to complete the portrait in a manner worthy of the subject. Nothing but sincere love and fidelity to the original will enable me to describe the impression which he made upon me in an intimate connexion of many years.

I saw him for the first time in the spring of 1816. That moment I can never forget. A few months before I had had some intercourse with him by letter, and had now come to Berlin, principally at his instance, to qualify myself for a place in the theological Faculty of that University. His letter expressed an earnest desire to serve me, rather than any hearty sentiments of friendship. I found the same spirit upon our first interview. The timidity and awe, with which I first approached him, yielded very gradually to other feelings. They were in fact increased by the admiration which was excited by the presence of his powerful mind, as displayed in his countenance and conversation. But it was at that time by no means owing to myself, that this timidity gradually wore away, and yielded to the sentiment of cordial and friendly esteem. Whoever took courage to seek his acquaintance, was soon met by him with great cordiality. It was not merely the cheerful and lively manner of his social intercourse, which took off from the oppressive effect of his great talents; but the delightful disposition, the simplicity, and naturalness, with which he opened his heart to all whom he thought worthy of his confidence. In such cases he not only permitted great freedom of access, but came forward himself in the most encouraging manner; and drew around him, in the closest intimacy, all who desired or who were susceptible of his friendship.

His affection was no effeminate tenderness which displayed itself in soft and flattering words, but a strong and glowing

principle, which gave not merely a gentle magnetic influence to the hearts of others, but smote them, as it were, with an electric shock; but, for this very reason, it possessed a fresh and powerful charm for men of vigorous and masculine characters. They who did not justly appreciate him in this respect would easily be repelled upon a near approach; and this has happened to many, who were accustomed to a more effeminate kind of friendship. But his own remarks on this point are perfectly true. "I am more certain of those," he says, "who really love myself, my own inward nature; my heart clings firmly to them, and will never let them go. They have known me, they have seen my mind; and they who once love it as it is, must always love it with increasing truth and warmth, the more it is manifested to them in its own form and individuality. I am as certain of this possession as I am of my own being; and in fact, I have never lost a man whose friendship I once enjoyed."

I am not the only one who can boast of his truth and constancy in friendship. They who were still more intimately connected with him can testify, even more strongly than myself, that he was one of the most faithful of beings, and that he was master of the noble art of retaining the ardent attachment of his friends, even amidst difficulties and misunderstandings. It is a common remark, that the inclination and the talent for friendship declines with years. But in this respect Schleiermacher always retained the freshness of youth. He never became a reserved and isolated man.

It may sound like a paradox to strangers, and to those who judge only according to appearance, but it is perfectly true, when I say, that it was love which presided over the deepest principles of his nature, and that even the severity of his intellect, his stinging wit, and the bitterness of expression with which he attacked and wounded his opponents, were never able to destroy the well-spring of love, which existed in his heart. I have never known an individual who possessed such large and generous tolerance, such a comprehensive spirit of charity, which enabled him to understand and to bear kindly every diversity of taste and intellect. With all his exactness and decision in the formation of his own opinions, he was always ready to discover and admit whatever was valuable in the opinions of others. When I lived with him at Berlin, I was struck with his fairness, which, in spite of numerous misunderstandings of his

character, never refused to acknowledge and commend every excellence, which was displayed by his associates in office, both in the church and the University. I remember more than once, that he corrected young men for expressing presumptuous and intolerant judgments upon others. "Let us honor the man," he would say, "who possesses merit and ability, though of his own kind."

Schleiermacher had no reason ever to fear an adversary, and he never did fear one. He was never wanting in adversaries, and quite as little in alacrity for the contest. If he was only personally attacked, unless the interests of an important cause which he had at heart were at the same time involved, he never defended himself. In such case he regarded silence as the best rebuke. For the usual disputes of learned men, he had neither sufficient time nor personal irritability. But when he saw the interests of truth, the welfare of the Church or of the State, in jeopardy, and that from no insignificant enemy, he did not linger for a moment; a cowardly submission was then as far from his thoughts, as a selfish regard to his own leisure and tranquillity. As a general rule, he was the first to appear on the scene of combat, he grappled his antagonist with all the strength, all the skill, and all the rights of an honorable warfare. He held that irony and the most pungent wit were admissible, nay even necessary in the exercise of controversy. He saw no reason for not using the weapon which nature had given to him. It was his opinion, that when he had to deal with a conceited and presumptuous adversary, there was no better means of impressing upon him the wholesome feeling of his own nothingness, than the scourge of a sharp and cutting wit. He had, indeed, a certain natural delight in wit, and was impelled to use it whenever he had the opportunity. But, in the excitement which this produced, he never lost sight of the cause which he had to defend. He engaged in controversy as a moral duty. He felt himself called to it by the nature of his mind, and by his love to the cause. As soon as he was convinced of the necessity of a controversy, he threw himself, with the whole force of his talents and character, against the pretensions of his opponent. The personal tone of his controversial style often served only to give it dramatic life, but it was usually far more the expression of his heart-felt sympathy with the cause, his sincere and earnest conviction of its truth. His mode of controversy was certainly neither comfortable to

himself nor to his adversary. He was truly in earnest, and wherever he touched he went to the quick. He was previously aware, that in many cases he should bring upon himself evil reports, hostilities, anger, and revenge; these he could not suffer without sorrow; but from love of his cause he willingly exposed himself to such evils, which in dealing with the great mass of opponents could not be avoided. His courage in these instances was greater than his discretion. Discreet as he certainly was, the discretion of convenience and cowardice he always disdained.

The number of those who engage in so many labors, who lead a life of such creative activity as Schleiermacher, must always be small. In his case much may be explained by the natural rapidity and certainty of his intellectual operations. Whatever he wrote for the press, was previously so well considered and complete, even in respect to its form, that, as he was always a master in the use of language, no alterations were needed. None of his discourses or lectures cost him more than the time required for a thorough meditation. In this way, whatever labor he undertook, his rare endowments gained him time and strength for new acquisitions and new enterprises. Besides this he was very economical of his time, and thus obtained leisure for every thing which his manifold duties demanded of him. It is true, that in later years, I have heard him complain, that he was no longer able to accomplish all that he wished. But it is always from the most active and efficient, that such complaints are heard, and the physical powers which are required do not increase with years. Schleiermacher never had but a small stock of bodily strength at command. His body was naturally weak and delicate, and when I lived with him, inclining to ill health. But how admirably did he govern it and compel it, even in moments of disease, to minister to his mind! Labors and journeys, official activity and social enjoyment, whatever the call, his physical nature must be competent and ready. In excursions on foot he was always the foremost, in the evening the latest to rest, and in the morning the earliest on the road. I know that he often preached and lectured while suffering from violent pain, without its being observed. It was usual to see him until late at night in society, which could never last too long for him, the most cheerful and animated of the company; and the next morning at six o'clock, with equal freshness, in the lecture-

room or the pulpit. This Socratic empire of the mind over the body belonged to the deepest elements of his nature, and secured to him in age the brightness of youth, which enabled him to perceive with a smile the light of the eye grow dim, and caused him, even to the latest breath, to take an active interest in the serious labors as well as the cheerful pleasures of life.

The death of Schleiermacher, in common with that of many great and noble individuals, possessed a powerful and quickening influence. It was the bright completion, the glorified image of his whole life.

When the intelligence of his death was made known, not only in Berlin, but throughout Germany, nay, as far as the German name extends, every voice was raised in lamentation at the great and irreparable loss. His friends and pupils, his admirers, his adversaries, and even strangers, his audience in the church and the Academy, the whole city in which he had lived, the court and the people, vied with each other in paying the most imposing funeral honors to his remains. This was certainly not merely an external testimony to his elevated character. It was a great and beautiful tribute to his name. But this is not what I have in view. I speak of the inward history of his death. I have read what those who were nearest to him in life, and who did not leave him for a moment during his last days, have written for their friends. I am permitted to copy from it that which is suitable for a wider circle. "His frame of mind, during the whole of his illness, was calm and bright. With the utmost gentleness he complied with all our arrangements. Not a sound of complaint or dissatisfaction was heard; always friendly and patient, though thoughtful and inclined to reflection. One day, as he awoke from slumber, that had been produced by an opiate, he called his wife to him and remarked: 'I am really in a state which wavers between consciousness and unconsciousness, but within my own mind I experience the most delightful moments. I cannot avoid engaging in the deepest speculations, but they are always in accordance with the strongest religious feelings.' "

I see in this a beautiful illustration of his whole life. The man, whose life had been devoted to the attainment of a perfect unity between religion and speculation, but who modestly and cautiously regarded it, not as the beginning, but as the

ultimate end of his contemplations, receives it as his reward and direction to heaven, in those moments when the outward man was perishing, in order that the inward man might ascend in freedom and purity, to the full enjoyment of eternal life in God. His last days and hours were pervaded and illumined by the influence of religion. Even his dreams were the image of his religious life and course of action.

"I have had," said he at one time, "such a beautiful dream, — it has left me with the most agreeable feelings. I thought I was in a vast assembly, with a great number both of acquaintances and of strangers. They all turned their eyes upon me, and wished to hear from me something on religion. It was the hour of instruction, and with what delight did I give it!"

As the awful moment drew near, he seemed to be more and more absorbed in love, as the innermost fountain of his being. He indulged in the most affectionate expressions concerning his children and friends. To the former he said: "I leave you for a legacy the words of John, my children, 'Love one another.'" "I enjoin it upon you," said he to his wife, "to remember me to all my friends, and tell them how dear they have been to my heart."

He had for some time been certain of his approaching death. He could wish to have been spared longer to his family. He felt that he had still many difficult tasks to perform before his entrance upon eternal rest. But he went forth to the last struggle with calmness and submission to the holy will of Everlasting Love.

"The last morning of his life, his sufferings evidently increased. He complained of violent internal burnings, and the cry of pain, for the first and the last time, was forced from his lips: 'Ah Lord, my sufferings are great!' In the most affecting manner, he then said to his family: 'My dear children, you must now all retire and leave me to myself. I would spare you the sight of so much misery.' The traces of death were now apparent in his countenance, his eye grew dim, and the death-struggle was ended. Laying his two fore fingers on his left eye, as he often did when engaged in deep reflection, he began to speak: 'We have the reconciling death of Jesus Christ, his body and his blood —.'" While saying this he raised himself up, his features became more animated, his voice grew clear and strong, and with priestly solemnity he

continued: 'Are you one with me in this faith?' His family assenting aloud, he went on: 'Let us then receive the supper of the Lord. There can be no need of the sexton.— Quick, quick, for it is not the time to think of forms.' While the service was preparing, his friends waited with him in solemn stillness. When every thing was ready, his countenance lighted up with an indescribable brilliancy; his eye beaming upon them with a higher glow of love, he commenced the words of invocation for the introduction of the holy ordinance. Then, repeating the form of consecration in a loud and distinct voice, he administered the bread and the wine, first to his family and then to himself, with the remark: 'I abide by these words of Scripture; they are the foundation of my faith.' After he had pronounced the blessing, his eye turned once more with an expression of perfect love, first to his wife, and then to every individual present, and, in those deep and earnest tones which penetrate the heart, he continued: 'In this fellowship and faith we are then one, and will remain so.'

"He now reclined on the pillow, the brightness still resting on his features. In a few minutes he said: 'I can remain here no longer.' And soon after: 'Give me another position.' They turned him on his side; he breathed a few times, and life stood still. In the mean time his children had come in and were kneeling round the bed. His eye gradually closed."

In the pangs of sorrow and the feeling of elevation I can add nothing but the words of Scripture: "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord." "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God; whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation." *

[* It should be stated here, that several passages in Dr. Lücke's original article, which have reference merely to local controversies, and of little interest to any one in this country, have been omitted in the translation. — Tr.]

ART. II. — *The Stranger's Gift. A Christmas and New Year's Present.* Edited by HERMANN BOKUM, Instructor in Harvard University. Boston, 1836. 12mo. pp. 103.

THIS little work is the production of one of that small but honored company of German scholars, who have made their home amongst us. They have sought under our institutions a sphere more congenial, than those of the old monarchies of Europe, to the temper of liberal minds, sympathizing with their race, and loving a free activity. They bring with them the goodly leaven of German thoroughness and industry, that zeal for learning for learning's sake, which we of this country need more of to rectify the popular superficialness to which we are all too prone. Distinguished for simplicity and purity of life, they modestly and unobtrusively enter upon any field of intellectual labor and usefulness for which they are found to be fitted. They adorn our letters, and within the scope of their influence do much to promote elementary education, and to animate and guide our young men in the pursuit of liberal studies. With remarkable readiness and facility they adopt our manners, language, sympathies, and enter into the spirit of our institutions. They are both *with* us and *of* us. They are more than welcome.

But "The Gift," — that also is welcome, as well as its "Stranger" giver. It is happily conceived, and is written with a wise and Christian intent. The author's religious sensibilities, his recollections of his native home and country, and his benevolent hopes seem to have clustered themselves naturally about the festival of Christmas (a time very dear and holy to a German), and this pleasant book is the result.

Mr. Bokum, from his first arrival in the country, appears to have felt a lively interest in the German emigrants whom he found here. His book relates chiefly to them, — their condition, wants, and prospects.

We are first introduced to the German settlements in the interior of Pennsylvania, which Mr. Bokum has visited. We regret that he cannot give us a more favorable account of them.

"They are called German because the land was originally occupied by German emigrants, and because those who now own it are descended from them, and are thought to retain the use of

the German language, though in many parts of the interior a native of Germany will find it very difficult to recognise his mother tongue. But a very small portion have carefully fostered those principles of religious and intellectual cultivation which they imbibed in their own country. The greater portion have not only been deprived of the light which their forefathers enjoyed, but have been likewise excluded in a great measure from the influences which operate favorably on the religious, moral, and intellectual state of the American people.

"It is well known, that the great mass of the first German settlers consisted of redemptioners, who fled from the oppression to which they had been subject in their native country. It is also known, that, by perseverance and industry, they succeeded in benefiting the country which had received them hospitably, and that they obtained a rich return from the produce of their agricultural labors. But it is far less known how little their religious and moral state corresponds to their physical well-being. The frequent and entire want of instruction, the necessity of gaining their livelihood by great and uninterrupted efforts, and the slow but certain reward which they obtained from the ground they cultivated, has been the cause that they seem to have become incapable of raising their eyes from the ground to Him who gave them both to will and to do according 'to his good pleasure.' The situation of their ministers almost prevents their usefulness, when they have to attend to the spiritual wants of six or seven congregations; and attempts at extending to them other means of instruction have but too often met with decided opposition, and have sometimes excited the most unexpected and unaccountable suspicions. A very devoted and benevolent friend of mine, for instance, endeavoured some time since to form a Sabbath school near the banks of the Lecha. For a long time he could not ascertain why his efforts were so little encouraged, until he finally was informed that he was suspected of forming this school with a view of increasing the tolls of the bridge over which the children had to pass. The state of morality, it may be easily imagined, cannot be a very high and devoted one where religion has so little practical influence." — pp. 25–27.

The following reasoning against education is original.

"But a few years ago an attempt was made in Pennsylvania to gain the influence of the rich German farmers in favor of a system of taxation, as it has been established in some of the New England States. 'If we have a general system of taxation,' was their short but logical reply, 'the children of the rich and the children of the poor will have the same means of being educated.

It is likewise certain, that the children of the poor will have time to go to school, while the children of the rich are employed eight months out of twelve on their farms. The children of the poor therefore will obtain three times as much learning as the children of the rich. In the course of time they will be sent to Congress, they will obtain all the good offices, and finally will rule over the children of the rich. — This shall never be the case!' " — p. 30.

It appears that these people still retain the stirring old superstitions that were bred centuries ago in the Black Forest and the Hartz Mountains. The Wild Huntsman has crossed the ocean, holds his spectral chase in the forest, and pays his noisy nightly visits to his German patrons here, as he did of old, (perhaps does now) in the heart of Europe. The potent horseshoe is still fixed over the door to keep off ghostly intruders. Blue lights hover over the spot where hid treasures ought to be discovered. The departed Indians have left the pow-wow physician to look after the health of their successors, and the tripod still occupies the corner of the sick-room, for the burning of efficacious charms. It would seem, that the entire race of elfs and goblins, which we are accustomed to suppose extinct, still flourish numerously in Pennsylvania, and exercise a lordly sway, undisturbed by the inroads of modern philosophy.

As to the literature of these degenerate children of Germany, "the Bible, some books on dreaming and witchcraft, and one or two German newspapers form the whole stock of their book-shelves." Of one of these newspapers Mr. Bokum has the following:

"It was at first only the strange mixture of German and English words and terminations which attracted your attention more than the matter itself. But how great is your astonishment, when you find that the political news which the paper contains, is the very opposite of what you happen to have read the very same day in an English morning paper. Where such glaring deceptions can be practised, you have reason to conclude that even those who know how to read, are greatly in danger of becoming the tools of designing men; and a second glance at the paper seems to establish this fact. You meet there with a petition which opposes the interests of education, and yet many of the signers have been compelled to make three crosses, because they are unable to sign their names!" — p. 33.

Our author acknowledges that he found some few "oases, as it were, in these fields, which are as barren and neglected in point of intellectual culture, as they are fruitful and abundantly productive in agricultural respects." There are some seminaries of learning, particularly in those parts which are most subject to the influence of the Anglo-Americans; and we all know that some German names are to be found amongst those of the eminent and honored citizens of Pennsylvania. But on the whole, says Mr. Bokum:

"It is out of the question to think of a strong feeling of sympathy, or of striking points of relationship, between the German emigrants who have enjoyed the common advantages of religious and intellectual cultivation, and those descendants of Germans who, by their language and peculiar situation, have been placed almost entirely beyond the pale of civilization. Seldom, indeed, have I felt so perfectly as a stranger in this fair land, as was the case on my visit to those 'Germans.'" — p. 37.

We have next a sketch of the author's pilgrimage in New York. He went, partly at least, to learn something of the Dutch population. But he acknowledges no relationship with them; they speak a distinct language from the German, — their ancestors came from the Netherlands. He has, however, given us two interesting chapters as the fruits of this journey.

We omit some miscellaneous matters, well worth the reading, though we cannot copy them, and pass with our author to a more interesting class of Germans, the recent emigrants, who within a few years have appeared in considerable numbers in our own community. There is something peculiar in the general character of this class of foreigners. Mr. Bokum says: "Whether you see them as pioneers, struggling through every difficulty and overcoming every obstruction, or whether you visit them, when collected in families and quietly enjoying the fruits of their labors, or whether, finally, you meet with the German merchant and mechanic mingling in the larger cities with the American population, — they enjoy everywhere the reputation of being a hard-working, temperate, and honest people, little inclined to give way to temptations to which the lower classes of society are generally exposed, and highly susceptible to those religious and intellectual influences which they have enjoyed at home."

We do not think this praise exaggerated. In a little settlement of two or three hundred, in the suburbs of Boston, consisting of peasants of the humbler orders, of which we have had some knowledge, we have found the above description substantially verified. They are not free, it is true, from all the faulty and disagreeable traits incident to their condition, but there is much to admire and respect in them. It is hardly possible to find one, who left Germany after the age of fourteen without being able both to read and write. They have a reverence for religion and its institutions, and desire to avail themselves of all its ordinances. When they have no other resourse, they attend religious services where they cannot understand a word. They are almost uniformly temperate. They seldom drink ardent spirits at all, and intoxication is extremely rare. Their voices are not heard in the riot or brawl. They fall quietly into the ranks of labor, and lay up their earnings carefully. They are not a reckless and thriftless people, like the corresponding class of some countries, but in general are grave, thoughtful, and intent upon the interests and responsibilities of life. There are many families in which the parents are advanced in life. They might have spent the remainder of their days in their native villages, in comfort and peace, sheltered from severe oppression by their obscurity; they would never have emigrated for their own sakes; but they were anxious that their children should enjoy what they deemed the precious "blessings of a free country, and have the produce of their labors secured to them." For this object they came forth, broke away the knitted associations of long lives, submitted to the rigors of a long voyage, and the hardships and crosses of a strange land, their little property spent, and only their children (perhaps a diminished number) left them. They sacrificed themselves for these. There is something noble and worthy of profound respect in the strength of character and wise parental forecast, which such conduct displays. May time prove that they have not erred in these hopes for their children, hopes so dearly paid for.

We are anxious that these strangers should not, through the force of adverse circumstances, share the bad fate of their brethren in Pennsylvania, — both for their sakes and our own; for here, fit or unfit, they soon become citizens and share the sovereign power of the State. We quote some good remarks of our author on this latter point.

"It seems hardly possible, that by his own endeavours the foreigner should become capable, in the short space of five years, to discharge faithfully the duties of a citizen of the United States, after he has lived for thirty or forty years under a monarchical form of government, and, when arrived in this country, has been separated to a great extent from the rest of the community by a difference of language, or prevented by incessant labor from acquainting himself with the peculiar character of this government. It seems impossible, I say, in regard to the German emigrant, who is generally capable and willing to assimilate with his neighbour, without divesting himself of his individuality, and it *is* certainly impossible in regard to those foreigners, who with an unbending and exclusive spirit keep aloof from every change in the national views and peculiarities which they imbibed in their own country. 'Let the Americans beware,' (says a well-known foreigner,) 'of extending the rights of citizenship indiscriminately to foreign emigrants;' and although there is often something in such laconic warnings addressed to a whole people, which savours of Shakspeare's 'I would croak like a raven, I would bode! I would bode!' it cannot prevent us from adding, that, until the naturalization laws shall be changed, — which indeed may never be the case, — let us engage in enlightening those to whom we extend these privileges." — pp. 84, 85.

Mr. Bokum hopes much from the institution of the "German Charitable Societies" established in Boston and the other principal cities of the Union. They are formed for the purpose of "exciting among themselves a fraternal spirit; to supply the needy and newly arrived with advice and employment, and the sick and feeble with pecuniary assistance." The active part which the educated and influential Germans take in this institution, must render it exceedingly useful to the humbler emigrants, who need every possible aid and good influence to save them from discouragement, suffering, and degeneracy.

Mr. Bokum suggests "the inquiry, whether the usefulness of the public schools in the principal cities of the Union might not be greatly increased by the addition of an Anglo-German branch, in which the children of the German emigrants might be instructed through the medium of the German language, until they are capable of proceeding with their American companions;" — a suggestion worthy the consideration of those municipal authorities, who are in some measure responsible for the character and competency of our future equals in citizenship.

But the most interesting effort, that has been made in behalf of these people, is the establishment in this city of a religious service in their own tongue and according to the forms of the Lutheran church. Through the exertions of Mr. Bokum, and others of the same spirit, the German Lutheran Synod in the United States have been instructed in their situation, and have engaged to establish a stated ministry here in the ensuing spring. In the mean time their religious culture is not neglected.

"Every Sabbath you may hear them unite in prayer, and in the singing of German hymns; you may see them listening attentively to the biblical explanations of their teacher, or, if sickness should prevent him from being present, to some well-selected printed sermon, read by one of their number. Availing themselves thus faithfully of the means of grace which they enjoy at present, they look forward with love and longing to the time when they shall enjoy all the religious privileges to which they had been accustomed at home. Their minister will preach to them partly in English and partly in German, and those Germans who have intermarried with natives will no longer be compelled to go to different places of worship, on account of their difference of language. Nor is their resolution to have English preaching in their church the only proof which they have given of their readiness to assimilate themselves to the Americans. But a few days ago, for instance, they assembled to listen to the Governor's proclamation, which had been translated for them into German; and though many of them, unlike their American hosts, are here without a family circle with which they might unite in thanksgiving and praise, they were consoled by the consciousness that they felt towards each other as members of the same family, as the 'children of God'; for 'our conversation,' they said, 'is in heaven, whence alone we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ.'" — pp. 96, 97.

It is refreshing and delightful to see the cultivated German minds amongst us laboring with warm sympathy and zeal in wise measures for the melioration of their countrymen's condition, — to save them from the downward course of ignorance, irreligion, and vice, to which the poor emigrant is exposed. It is a natural and a Christian service, and the worthiest they can render, both to the country of their birth and that of their adoption. We wish them encouragement and success.

G. P.

Art. III. — 1. *The Comprehensive Commentary on the Holy Bible; containing the Text according to the authorized Version; Scott's Marginal References; Matthew Henry's Commentary, condensed, but retaining every Useful Thought; the Practical Observations of Rev. Thomas Scott, D. D.; with Extensive Explanatory, Critical, and Philological Notes, selected from Scott, Doddridge, Gill, Adam Clarke, Patrick, Lowth, Burder, Harmer, Calmet, Stuart, Robinson, Bush, Rosenmueller, Bloomfield, and many other writers on the Scriptures. The whole designed to be a Digest and Combination of the Advantages of the best Bible Commentaries, and embracing nearly all that is valuable in Henry, Scott, and Doddridge. Conveniently arranged for Family and Private Reading, and at the same time particularly adapted to the wants of Sabbath School Teachers and Bible Classes; with numerous useful Tables, and a neatly engraved Family Record.* Edited by Rev. William Jenks, D. D., Pastor of Green-Street Church, Boston; Member of the American Antiq. and Mass. Histor. Societies; and formerly Professor of Oriental Languages and of the English Language in Bowdoin College, Maine. Embellished with five Portraits, and other elegant Engravings, from steel plates; several Maps, and many wood-cuts, illustrative of Scripture Manners, Customs, Antiquities, etc. 8vo. Genesis — Judges. Matthew — John. 1835, 1834. Brattleborough: Fessenden & Co. Boston: Shattuck & Co. pp. 830, 837.

2. *The same.* [*Baptist Edition.*] Re-edited and adapted to the views of the Baptist Denomination of Christians by Rev. Joseph A. Warne, Pastor of the Baptist Church in Brookline. Boston: Lincoln, Edmands, & Co. and James Loring. Brattleborough: Fessenden & Co.

3. *Notes, Explanatory and Practical, on the Gospels: designed for Sunday School Teachers and Bible Classes.* By Albert Barnes. 12mo. 2 vols. Sixth Edition. 1835. New York: Leavitt, Lord, & Co. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. pp. 379, 364.

4. *Notes, etc. on the Acts of the Apostles.* By Albert Barnes. Second Edition. 1835. pp. 356.

5. *Notes, etc. on the Epistle to the Romans.* By Albert Barnes. 1835. pp. 328.

Of the first of the above named Commentaries, we have before us the two volumes containing from Genesis to Judges, and from Matthew to John, inclusive; and have examined them with emotions of constantly increasing disappointment. When we first saw the prospectus sanctioned by the venerable name of Dr. Jenks as editor, we cherished a confident expectation that the work would bear at least some faint marks of the philological learning for which he is famed. But he appears simply as the *rédacteur* of prescribed materials, and seems hardly to have exercised the prerogative of a free agent or an independent thinker throughout these volumes. Even the introductions, which are brief treatises on the genuineness, authenticity, and inspiration of the Old and New Testaments, are made up entirely of quotations, with the occasional insertion of a connecting clause by the Editor. Yet, wherever he overcomes his characteristic modesty, and favors us with an annotation of his own, we perceive so many traces of the scholar and the candid critic, that we are constrained to inquire: "To what purpose is this waste?" Why might not the dusty work of compilation have been committed to some mere journeyman, and he, who is engaged in it, have been left at leisure to give to the world the fruits of his own indefatigable studies?

The work was "designed to be a *digest*"; but we are sorry to say, it is the most crude, undigested mass of heterogeneous materials that ever came under our critical cognizance. The work can hardly be criticized as a whole. The only way in which we can discharge the office we have undertaken, is to present a view of the general aspect of the volumes, and then to consider separately the worth of the several commentaries from which they are compiled.

There is much about the work which has the air of pecuniary speculation. The title-page, with its pompous array of names, its reference to the wants of families, sabbath school teachers, and bible classes, its enumeration of the various signs and wonders to be seen within, — to wit, "a neatly engraved family record,* five portraits, other elegant engravings

* Of this record we have a specimen in the prospectus, surmounted by doves, Cupid, arrows, and all the paraphernalia of Pagan love-scenes. This is probably the first instance, in which Cupid has found his way into the Bible.

from steel plates, and many wood-cuts," was evidently designed to captivate the illiterate and unwary purchaser. Then there is an obtrusive thrusting in of notices and advertisements by the publishers, who take repeated opportunities to assure the readers of the unprecedented expensiveness, cheapness, and popularity of the work. Nor can we forbear in this connexion taking notice of the numerous pictures, which cannot but render these volumes attractive to the vulgar gaze. The minute wood-cuts, with which the notes are frequently interspersed, are for the most part valuable as illustrative of ancient customs and monuments, and reflect great credit on the Editor's learning and taste. The same may be said of the numerous maps. But we must be permitted to express our unfeigned disgust at most of the "elegant engravings," which, scattered at convenient distances, on leaves of pink, straw-colored, and dingy white paper, give the "Comprehensive Commentary" a no less grotesque, though a less sombre aspect, than the family bibles of our grandfathers bore.

Never have we seen in print so apt a type of chaos as the page of the "Comprehensive Commentary" presents. The text of the common version, printed in *small pica*, is crowded into a column about an inch broad and often not more than two inches long, in the upper left-hand corner, and there it stands, like "a lodge in a garden of cucumbers," completely overgrown and hidden by the luxuriance of verbose commentary. Beneath it, in the most minute type visible, are the marginal references. Beside and beneath, in two finely printed columns of very unequal width, is Henry's Commentary; beneath this Scott's Practical Observations in two equal columns; and under all, separated by a black line, in a yet more obscure type, stands, in two equal columns, a miscellaneous collection of short and often imperfect extracts, from the annotations of Scott, Doddridge, Gill, Clarke, and others too numerous to be specified.

But let us pass from outward appearances to the respective merits of component parts of this compilation. First of all, we have Scott's Marginal References, which are vastly inferior in utility and critical worth to Canne's, inasmuch as the latter are founded on generally recognised grounds of resemblance and laws of association, while the former often refer the reader to texts, which bear kindred to the text referred from, only by

the fanciful theories and modes of interpretation connected with modern Calvinism.

Next we have "Matthew Henry's Commentary, condensed, but retaining every useful thought," together with hundreds that are irrelevant and useless. We find it hard to account for Henry's popularity as a commentator, unless it be that he took the field early and retains it by right of precedence. The very quantity of matter in his original work, (and it is very slightly abridged in this,) *five volumes folio*, is truly appalling; and yet Dr. Doddridge advised his theological pupils to read it entirely and attentively through. In justice we can hardly assign Henry a place on the list of *commentators*; he may with more propriety be reckoned as the last and most vapid of the race of *allegorical paraphrasts*. His object, with regard to a sentence, is not to ascertain the one idea which the writer intended to convey in it, but to show how many senses every word in the sentence may bear, and how complete a system of theology may be built up by its dismemberment. His principles, or, to speak more properly, his mode of interpretation is, like Procrustes' bed, a changeless standard for adjusting the dimensions of whatever falls into his hands. The historical books are interpreted as if their every sentence had been penned with reference to the five points of Calvinism; while every poetical image in the Psalms or the Prophets is regarded, either as inculcating one of the doctrines of grace, relating a historical fact, or definitely foretelling some future event. Thus the sacred text, in Henry's hands, like charity, "beareth all things, endureth all things." One consequence of this mode of interpretation is the grossest and most ludicrous inconsistency in representations of the divine character, sometimes portraying the attributes of God in their full spirituality and perfection, and then again degenerating into the lowest forms of anthropomorphism. Thus we could multiply passages in which he depicts all things past, present, and future, as constantly present to the divine mind; but yet, in order to draw a spiritual meaning from the Lord's "coming down" to see the tower of Babel, our author favors us with a comment, well worthy of those priests of Baal, whose god might be "pursuing, or in a journey, or asleep." "Before God gave judgment on their cause," says he, "he *inquired* into it; for God is incontestably just and fair in all his pro-

ceedings against sin and sinners, and condemns none unheard." We may quote also from the annotations on this chapter a few specimens of what Professor Stuart styles Henry's "quaintness," that is, his skill in eliciting a moral meaning where none exists. On the words, "Go to, *let us* build," we have the following godly exhortation: "Let us learn to provoke one another to love and to good works, as sinners stir up and encourage each other to wicked works. See Ps. cxxii. 1. Isa. ii. 3, 5. Jer. l. 5." On the use of *brick* and *pitch* by the builders of Babel, we are requested to observe, "What a difference there is between man's building and God's; when God builds his Jerusalem, he lays even the *foundations of it with sapphires, and all its borders with pleasant stones,* Isa. liv. 11, 12. Rev. xxi. 19." Again our author gives the following lucid and edifying exposition of perhaps the most unemphatic phrase in the chapter:

"It is said to be *the tower which the children of men built;* intimating, (1.) Their weakness and frailty as men: it was a foolish thing for worms of the earth to defy heaven and to provoke the Lord to jealousy: *Are they stronger than He?* (2.) Their sinfulness and obnoxiousness: they were the sons of *Adam*; so the Hebrew; nay, of that sinful, disobedient Adam, whose children are by nature children of disobedience, children that are corrupters. (3.) Their distinction from *the children of God,* the professors of religion; from whom these daring builders had separated themselves, and built this tower to perpetuate the separation. Pious Eber* is not found among this ungodly crew; for he and his are called *the children of God,* and therefore their souls *come not into the secret, nor unite themselves to the assembly, of these children of men.*"

This, we suppose, will aptly illustrate what Dr. Alexander (as quoted by Dr. Jenks) terms Henry's "*ubiquity* in the Scriptures." His ubiquity doubtless consists in his being everywhere the same, in his distilling every word of the Bible, from Genesis to the Apocalypse, in that one identical, comprehensive alembic, his own mind. To illustrate Henry's tedious prolixity and labyrinthal complexity, we will mention in pass-

* The fact of Eber's piety the sacred historian does not relate; but it was needed to "point the moral"; *ergo,* it is a fact.

ing, that our last quotation is but a subdivision of a single note on Genesis xi. 5–9, which comprises *three* general heads, *eight* principal subdivisions, *twenty-four* divisions of the third order, *nine* of the fourth, and even *two* of the fifth, and all these indicated by figures. Nor is this a singular or a carefully chosen case; but one taken at hazard, in the belief that similar instances may be found in every chapter. To sum up in brief our verdict upon Henry, we will say, that, had the Bible been written by one man, and that man an Englishman and a Calvinist, we would not ask a better commentator than Henry; but that for ancient, Oriental writings, varying in style, in sentiment, and in spirit, we could not have had a more unapt interpreter.

The next ingredient in the "Comprehensive Commentary" is Scott's Practical Observations. These are in general ingenious, safe, and good; and constitute the redeeming property of his Family Bible. They breathe the spirit of ardent piety, and are particularly valuable as inculcating, on every convenient occasion, the obligations of domestic and social duty. They diffuse over the books of the Old Covenant the evangelical spirit of the New; and point us to the substance, where the prophets held forth only the shadow of good things to come. And this, though it would destroy the value of a purely critical work, is the way in which every well-informed biblical scholar will endeavour to make the Old Testament practically useful to himself and others. We have often admired the skill, with which Scott extracts spiritual nutriment from that which at first sight seems utterly barren and unprofitable, so as literally to verify the words of the prophet: "The parched ground shall become a pool, and the thirsty land springs of water." Thus on those chapters of hard names, with which the first book of Chronicles commences, he entertains us with the most just and eminently Christian reflections on the lapse of time, the vanity of life, the worth of a good name, the levelling power of the grave, and the certainty of a resurrection and judgment to all the successive generations of men; and has thus demonstrated by successful experiment, that *all* scripture is "profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness." But we must say, (and have already implied as much,) that, had Scott, after the custom of many old divines, denominated these Observations,

practical *inferences*, we should have written *non sequitur* on every page of the Old Testament and on many of the new.

Among the miscellaneous notes, which make up the residue of the "Comprehensive Commentary," those of Scott have the precedence, and are inserted almost entire. Scott was a man, though of less learning, of more sense than Henry. He therefore does not allegorize so unsparingly, and makes more frequent allowances for the genius of the time and place, the peculiarities of style, and the various idioms of prose and verse, of the historical and didactic writings. But his education and his situation alike unfitted him for the office of a critic. His course of early study was very superficial; nor had he at any period (if we rightly remember) a large library at his command. A great part of his Commentary, his biographer informs us, was written while he held one child in his left arm, and with his foot rocked the cradle of another; and often with the printer's boy waiting at the door for copy. That a man so circumstanced should have written a popular work is strange; that he should have written a learned work impossible. Nor will critical examination belie the inferences which we should naturally draw from these facts. Almost every criticism is borrowed from preceding English commentators, particularly from Patrick, Lowth, Henry, Whitby, and Doddridge. Nor is there a single controverted or difficult point, on which Scott can be said to have expressed an opinion peculiarly his own. He is often grossly inaccurate, and often appears as the advocate of views and theories, in his days obsolete, but currently received when the authors from whom he drew most largely wrote.

In the volume on the New Testament before us, large and valuable extracts are made from Doddridge's "Family Expositor," a work of much learning, beautiful in style, full of devout sentiment, and (we cannot but think) still maintaining the first place among the popular commentaries in our language.

Great use is also made in the volumes before us of Gill's "Exposition," a work abounding in Rabbinical lore, but characterized by diffuseness, obscurity, inconsistency, and the entire lack of uniform principles of interpretation.

We have also copious extracts from Adam Clarke, who, in learning surpassing all, in judgment falls short of all English commentators, — who, on every involved point, allows you

your choice between a host of conflicting theories, but is very sure to elect as his own the most unnatural and absurd.

But time would fail us to characterize the individual critics, to whom a predominant place is given in the "Comprehensive Commentary." We must hasten to communicate our impressions of it as a whole. And the first thing that occurs to us, in turning over its pages, is, that it is designed to bring back Orthodoxy to her old moorings, and to anchor her there. It seeks out "the old paths," and bids its readers to "walk therein" without looking to the right hand or to the left. It carefully excludes every ray (except with regard to unessential minutiæ of geography and history) from heterodox luminaries, while it concentrates all the light of Orthodox genius, research, and acumen. It shields the one true faith by entire silence with regard to the existence of any other modes of belief. While it discusses with tedious minuteness all the points that were mooted among the divines of the last century, but have been regarded as definitively settled by critics of the present, it does not so much as indicate the existence of the numerous questions now at issue between the Liberal and the Orthodox school of interpreters. It thus stirs up the waters of strife in long stagnant pools, while over the broad sea of modern controversy it pours the oil of a deceptive calm. We cannot but think that this course, in a work professedly adapted to the time, indicates a lack of fairness and honesty. But, in making so grave a charge as this, we may be justly called upon for proof. We will therefore give our readers a few prominent instances, in which the "Comprehensive Commentary" omits all mention of important points in controversy.

Nor need we go beyond the first verse in the Bible for a case in point. We are there told, with regard to the plural form of the divine name, that "the Hebrew *Elohim* bespeaks the plurality of persons in the Godhead, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost;" and again, that "this grammatical anomaly, at the very opening of the Scriptures, seems intended to give us some intimation concerning that mystery, which is afterwards more fully revealed, namely the *Plurality* in the *Unity* of the Godhead." Nor is there a word said of any other possible mode of accounting for this plural form. We confess that we were not prepared for this from so learned an editor as Dr. Jenks. Even if he had retained the above-quoted

notes from Henry and Scott, we should have expected, for honesty's sake, at least an expression of doubt as to their soundness. It is now generally admitted by the most Orthodox critics, that *Elohim* is simply a plural of majesty or excellence, in entire accordance with a common Hebrew idiom. Professor Stuart in his Grammar denominates this plural the "*pluralis excellentiæ*," and says that it is applied to "most of the words which signify *Lord*, *God*, etc.," "for the sake of emphasis." But since the "Comprehensive Commentary" disdains all mention of this, the only reasonable solution of the "grammatical anomaly," we shall look forward with interest to the volume containing the Book of Job, hoping to find the doctrine of a "*Plurality in Unity*" lucidly expounded with regard to the great beast *Behemoth*,* whose name is, like *Elohim*, a plural noun joined with singular verbs and represented by singular pronouns.

The six days of creation are disposed of with singular ingenuity. It was deemed unsafe so much as to hint at the theory that the days were ages or indefinitely long periods of time. But yet it seemed expedient to insert the ready testimony borne by eminent geologists to the authenticity of the Mosaic account of the creation. The words which they used with reference to their own views of that account are therefore quoted, and applied to the common notion of a creation in six days of twenty-four hours each. Thus Cuvier is cited, as asserting, "that the human race *cannot* be more ancient than it is represented to be in the writings of Moses;" but it is not stated that Cuvier located the creation of man at the close of the last of six ages of indefinite length, corresponding to the Mosaic days. Thus also Jameson is quoted as saying: "The structure of the earth, and the mode of distribution of extraneous fossils or petrefactions, are so many direct evidences of the truth of the Scripture account of the formation of the earth; and they might be used as proofs of its author's having been inspired, because the mineralogical facts discovered by modern naturalists were unknown to the sacred historian." But Jameson said this in the belief that the Mosaic account indicated the gradual reduction of the earth from its chaotic state, and

* Job xl. 15.

the creation at successive and far distant epochs of the different classes of vegetables and animals, the fossil remains of which are found in the upper strata of the crust of our planet.

For another instance of this careful exclusion of controverted points, we will refer to the celebrated passage in Jacob's last words:* "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come, and unto him shall the gathering of the people be." Many sound critics, even of the Orthodox school, admit that this is an erroneous rendering, and would translate the verse as follows: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor the staff from between his feet, till he come to Shiloh, and to him shall the obedience of the people be rendered." This, considered as Jacob's dying command, was literally obeyed, Judah having had the precedence in all the marches and encampments of the children of Israel, until they set up the tabernacle of God in Shiloh.† But there is not a word of this in the "Comprehensive Commentary." On the other hand, the city of Shiloh is not so much as mentioned; but we are told, in the language of Scott, that by the word Shiloh, "*all allow* that the Messiah was intended, who was sent into the world, as the promised Seed, to be *the Prince of Peace.*"

The prophecy of Balaam, "I shall see him, but not now; I shall behold him, but not nigh," &c.‡ is applied to Jesus of Nazareth, without so much as the slightest expression of doubt, (though few are the critics of the present day, who would risk their reputation by citing it as prophetical of the Messiah;) but we are still left in uncertainty as to the manner in which the clause, "*shall smite the corners of Moab,*" was fulfilled in the weaponless and suffering career of a Redeemer, who lived many centuries after the Moabites had ceased to be a nation.

With regard to the quotations from the prophetical books in the New Testament, the same policy of concealment is observed. The theory of a double sense is assumed throughout. All that is said on the subject of these quotations in the volume containing the Gospels, is comprehended in the sage remark of Scott, that "Many prophecies seem to have had a

---

*Genesis xlix. 10. †See Numbers ii. 9, x. 14. Joshua xviii. 1.
‡Numbers xxiv. 17.

double meaning, both respecting the church, and Christ the Head of the church;" and the devout exclamation of Henry, "The Scripture has many accomplishments, so copious is it, and so well ordered in all things!" The theory of rhetorical accommodation is not so much as hinted at, though the many very eminent names which might be cited in its favor certainly demanded for it at least a passing notice.

In like manner, in the proem of John's Gospel, much ink is needlessly shed to prove, what no one at the present day thinks of denying, that John asserts the supreme divinity of the *Logos*; but on the very point at issue among theologians, viz. whether the *Logos* denote Jesus of Nazareth, the affirmative is taken for granted, without a word of discussion. So also, the exclamation of Thomas, "My Lord and my God," is treated as a deliberate profession of faith, and consequently as decisively proving the Supreme Deity of Christ, without so much as an attempt to rebut the idea, that it was a mere ejaculation of surprise.

These instances of the peculiar policy manifested in the work before us may suffice. We must yet further object to the moral tone of the "Comprehensive Commentary." The misdeeds of the patriarchs and their families are passed over too lightly. The most flimsy excuses are suggested for them, and, if not admitted in full, are at least allowed in palliation of the highest offences. Thus, among the modes of accounting for the flagitious conduct of Lot's daughters and of Tamar, is mentioned the hope, which every woman probably entertained, of becoming the mother of the Messiah. Now we wish to have the faults of the ancient saints and the misdeeds of their families set forth in full relief; and deem the record of them a record of priceless value, inasmuch as it illustrates the necessity and worth of the Christian revelation, by the aid of which the humblest disciple of Jesus can overcome temptations, to which even the greatest and best, unenlightened by the Gospel, have yielded. Nor should we be surprised if the cloaks, so ingeniously woven for the sins of former times, should be adopted and worn by sinful readers of the present day. We must also object to the sanguinary spirit, in which the destruction of the Canaanites is commented upon in this work. Whether the barbarities practised by the Hebrews under Joshua could, in any sense or degree, have been commanded

by God, or whether the Hebrews did not rather religiously ascribe whatever they deemed glorious to the promptings of Him, whose chosen people they were, we will not now pause to inquire. But certain are we, that the meek spirit of the Gospel demands tears rather than triumph over the fate of the ungodly tribes, that perished by the sword of Israel. Yet there is in the work now before us much of the same spirit of savage triumph, which must have elated the destroyers of Jericho and Ai, — much of that unevangelical temper, which led David to mar the beauty of one of his most devout and touching psalms by saying: "Do not I *hate* them, O Lord, that hate thee?" But what shall we say of the moral bearing of a work, which can admit such a sentiment as the following, (gratuitously superinduced by Henry upon the simple fact of Abraham's seeing the smoke of Sodom:) "Thus the saints, when they see the smoke of Babylon's torment rising up for ever, will say again and again, *Alleluia!* Rev. xix. 3. Those that have, in the day of grace, most earnestly interceded for sinners, will, in the day of judgment, be content to see them perish, and will glorify God in it." If such be the spirit that pervades the ranks of the Saviour's ransomed, most earnestly would we pray: "O my soul, come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly, mine honor, be not thou united." Indeed, the editor's humanity seems to have been shocked by this passage; and he inserts, what we believe he has done in no other instance, a marginal note in the middle of the page, in which he attempts to soften down the harshness of Henry's sentiment, — a sentiment, as he informs us, "by many regarded with horror, as contrary to humanity, and evincing a soul *without natural affection*, and therefore *reprobate*."

The moral tone of the volume on the Gospels is much higher and purer than that of the first volume. For there is here too much of Christian gentleness and loveliness in the text to be entirely eclipsed even by the sombre medium of Henry's comment. Moreover, in this volume a good degree of prominence is given to Doddridge's "Family Expositor," — a work replete with the spirit of confiding, cheerful, evangelical piety.

We would, if we conscientiously could, mingle praise with our censure. But we can imagine no one point of view, in which this work is a valuable accession to the library of biblical

criticism or practical piety. As a critical manual it is entirely nugatory; as a practical guide, humanity and devotion it will often mislead. To the industry and fidelity of the amiable and accomplished Editor we would however render our just tribute of applause; and at the same time express our unfeigned regret, that he has not exerted them on an enterprise worthy of his talents and character.

The "Baptist Edition" of the "Comprehensive Commentary" differs from the Pedobaptist in no particulars except those pertaining to Baptism. In the notes Mr. Warne has occasionally expunged words, sentences, or paragraphs, and substituted others to suit Baptist views. In such cases, his own substitutions are included in brackets, with the abbreviation, "Bap. Ed." annexed.

We pass now to the more pleasant duty of reviewing Barnes's Notes, — works of unprecedented popularity, the "Notes on the Gospels" having in the short space of three years passed through *six* editions of *two thousand* copies each, and the two more recent volumes offering fair promise of an equally rapid and extensive circulation. It is doubtless known to most of our readers, that the author has recently been convicted of heresy by the Synod of Philadelphia, and suspended by a decree of that body "from the exercise of all the functions proper to the Gospel ministry, until he shall retract his errors, and give satisfactory evidence of repentance." But we apprehend that Mr. Barnes, so far from succumbing to ecclesiastical tyranny, will become the leader of an independent secession from the Presbyterian body. His own church and congregation have held seditious meetings against "the powers that be," and have unanimously passed resolutions, in which they declare that the proceedings of the Synod "have not in the least degree diminished their attachment to, and confidence in their pastor, but have rather tended to increase their love for him, and desire to attend on his ministration of the Word of God." Similar meetings have been held by other congregations, and Committees of Conference have been appointed to act in concert against the encroachments of bigotry. We bid them "God speed."

The specifications by which the accusation against Mr. Barnes was sustained, are principally drawn from his "Notes on the Romans"; and the real ground of complaint seems to

have been, not so much that he has directly impugned the "Confession of Faith," as that he has failed to deduce its leading doctrines from the very passages in this Epistle, on which alone they rely for their foundation. He has kept himself clear from human theories, and has endeavoured to let the sacred authors, in every instance, speak for themselves; and, because he has forborne putting the Apostles to the rack, has himself become the subject of Inquisitorial severity. We quote the following passage from his preface to the Epistle to the Romans, as illustrative of the spirit in which he has thus far discharged his office as a commentator.

"One principal reason for the controversies which have grown out of this epistle, has been an unwillingness to stop where the Apostle does. Men have desired to advance farther, and penetrate the mysteries which the Spirit of inspiration has not disclosed. Where Paul states a simple *fact*, men often advance a *theory*. The *fact* may be clear and plain; their *theory* is obscure, involved, myterious, or absurd. By degrees they learn to *unite* the fact and the theory: — they regard *their* explanation as the only possible one; and, as the *fact* in question has the authority of divine revelation, so they insensibly come to regard their theory in the same light; and he that calls in question their speculation about the *cause*, or the *mode*, is set down as heretical, and as denying the doctrine of the Apostle. A melancholy instance of this we have in the account which the Apostle gives (ch. v.) about the effect of the sin of Adam. The simple *fact* is stated, that that sin was followed by the sin and ruin of all his posterity. Yet he offers no explanation of the *fact*. He leaves it as indubitable; and as not demanding an explanation in his argument, — perhaps as not admitting it. This is the whole of his doctrine on that subject. Yet men have not been satisfied with that. They have sought for a theory to account for it. And many suppose they have found it in the doctrine that the sin of Adam is *imputed*, or set over by an arbitrary arrangement, to beings otherwise innocent, and that they are held to be responsible for a deed committed by a man thousands of years before they were born. This is the *theory*; and men insensibly forget that it *is mere theory*, and they blend that and the *fact* which the Apostle states together; and deem the denial of the one, heresy, as much as the denial of the other, i. e. they make it as impious to call in question *their philosophy*, as to doubt *the facts* stated on the authority of *the Apostle Paul*. If men desire to *understand* the Epistles of Paul, and avoid difficulties, they should be willing to leave it where *he* does; and this single rule would have made useless whole years and whole tomes of controversy. — p. x.

Mr. Barnes's works are most admirably adapted, as they were "designed, for Sunday School Teachers and Bible Classes." They give the results, without the parade, of learning. They refer largely from scripture to scripture. They shun the technical phrases of scholastic theology, and convey the sense of the sacred books in a familiar, an almost colloquial style. They are rich in archæological, historical, and biographical illustrations. Moreover, there are at convenient intervals practical observations and inferences, always too pertinent to appear obtrusive, too pointed to elude attention, too brief to grow tedious. Nor would these books be useful to those only, whose means of Scriptural research have been limited. To the well-read critical scholar they may often prove valuable, as embodying in a succinct form materials for interpretation, which, if lost from memory, he could not otherwise recover without great expense of time and labor. So seldom do the author's distinctive doctrinal sentiments make their appearance, that, while for the most part we could desire no additions, were the work re-edited under Unitarian supervision, we should make exceedingly few omissions. Indeed, on many of the standard Trinitarian proof-texts, Mr. Barnes has candidly indicated the inadequacy of the text to prove the doctrine. Thus, for instance, though he gives it as his personal opinion, that the words of Jesus, "I and my Father are one," * refer "to the *oneness* or *unity of nature* between the Father and the Son," he with singular honesty commences his note on this verse as follows:

"The word translated *one* is not in the *masculine* but in the *neuter* gender. It expresses *union*, but not the precise nature of the union. It *may* express any kind of union, and the particular kind intended is to be inferred from the connexion. In the previous verse he had said that he and his Father were *united* in the same object, that is, in redeeming and preserving his people. It was *this* that gave occasion for this remark. Many interpreters have understood this as referring to union of design and of plan. The words may bear this construction." — Vol. II. p. 275.

Sometimes Mr. Barnes does not so much as suggest a Trinitarian idea, in commenting on texts which have been deemed decidedly and irresistibly Trinitarian in their bearing. This

* John x. 30.

is the case with the note on the words, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," * which we will quote entire, as a fair specimen of the style of doctrinal exposition, which pervades the several volumes of the "Notes."

"*He that hath seen me.* He that has seen my works, heard my doctrines, and understood my character. He that has given *proper attention* to the proofs that I have afforded that I came from God, *hath seen the Father.* This cannot refer to the *essence* or *substance* of God, for he is invisible, and in that respect no man has seen God at any time. All that is meant, when it is said that *God is seen*, is, that some *manifestation* of Him has been made; or some such *exhibition* as that we may learn his *character*, his *will*, and his *plans*. In this case it cannot mean, that he that had seen Jesus with the bodily eyes, had *in the same sense* seen God; but he that had been a witness of his miracles and of his transfiguration, — that had heard his doctrines and studied his character, — had had full evidence of his divine mission, and of the *will and purpose* of the Father in sending him. The knowledge of the Son was itself, of course, the knowledge of the Father. There was such an intimate *union* in their nature and designs, that he who understood the one did also the other." — Vol. II. pp. 308, 309.

As another signal instance of fairness, we may cite the remark made on the words, "He is Lord of all," in Peter's discourse at the house of Cornelius. "This does not necessarily imply divinity; but only that the Lord Jesus, as Mediator, had been constituted or appointed Lord over all nations."

On the atonement our author's views are far in advance of those of the church to which he belongs. Though he maintains that Christ was in some sense "a *substitute* in the place of sinners," he denies a strictly and fully vicarious atonement, and makes the Saviour's death important chiefly as an illustration of the inherent and essential connexion between sin and suffering. He speaks of atonement by the shedding of innocent blood, not as an arbitrary appointment, or as intrinsically necessary, but simply as the best mode in which the sinner could be made to feel the heniousness of sin, and to cast himself at the footstool of divine mercy. Who will deny that in the sufferings of Christ, Infinite Wisdom might have designed to produce the moral effect indicated in the following passage?

---

* John xiv. 9.

"The fact that Christ endured such sufferings to show the evil of violating the law, is one of the strongest motives prompting to obedience. We do not easily and readily repeat that which overwhelms our best friends in calamity; and we are brought to *hate* that which inflicted such woes on the Saviour's soul. . . . . This is an advantage in moral influence which no cold, abstract law ever has over the human mind. And one of the chief glories of the plan of salvation is, that, while it justifies the sinner, it brings a new set of influences from heaven, more tender and mighty than can be drawn from any other source, to produce obedience to the law of God." — *Notes on the Romans*, p. 92.

The atonement is spoken of throughout these volumes, not as the offering of a gracious Redeemer to appease the Father's wrath, but as a work of love on the part of the Father as well as of the Son.

On the subject of man's nature, capacities, and duty, our author is sound and lucid. The idea of hereditary depravity he spurns as unworthy even a passing notice. He asserts repeatedly that men sin only "*in their own persons*, — *sin themselves*, — as, indeed, how *can* they *sin* in any other way?" The imputation of Adam's transgression he treats as a scholastic absurdity. "Those who are condemned, are not condemned for the sin of another without their own concurrence, nor unless they personally deserve it." "In the divine administration none are *regarded* as guilty who are not guilty." Of the figment of Adam's federal headship, and the condemnation of his posterity for partnership in his sin, Mr. Barnes says, "There is not one word of it in the Bible." "It is a mere philosophical theory; an introduction of a speculation into theology, with an attempt to explain what the Bible has left unexplained." "Nowhere in the Scriptures is the word *covenant* applied to any transaction with Adam." "How can it be right to charge the sins of the guilty on those who had no participation in them? How *could* millions be responsible for the sins of one who acted long before they had an existence, and of whose act they had no consciousness, and in which they had no participation?" The imputed righteousness of Christ is similarly disposed of. "None are constituted righteous," says our author, "who do not voluntarily avail themselves of the provisions of mercy."

These "Notes" stand in advantageous contrast to the "Comprehensive Commentary," inasmuch as they abhor the

policy of concealment, and give, on every important point of controversy within the scope of a popular work, a fair view of both sides of the question, generally with the arguments employed by the advocates of each.

The principal defect which characterizes these works, regarded in a critical point of view, is one which (far from being carried to excess) heightens their practical interest and value. We refer to the occasional insertion of a beautiful and truly Christian sentiment, which the words immediately under consideration suggest, but which the context shows could not have been present to the sacred writer's mind. Thus, on the words, "In my Father's house are many mansions," * which the whole context limits in their application to the heaven whither Jesus was going, and would one day welcome his disciples, our author gives us a touching and beautiful amplification of the idea, that heaven and earth are separate mansions of the universal house of God, that thus Jesus after his ascension, and the Apostles, yet treading in his footsteps of toil and suffering, were to be fellow-tenants of the same house of his Father and their Father. Thus also, the unity of the parables is often marred by the attempt to give a meaning, whereever it will admit of a true and good meaning, to their mere imagery.

The "Notes on the Epistle to the Romans" are defective, for want of a good program of the Apostle's argument at the commencement, and regular indications of his transitions and digressions, of the points made and combated, of the reasonings employed by the sacred penman himself, and the reasonings put by him into the mouths of imagined interlocutors. Mr. Barnes interprets this Epistle too much as a series of aphorisms, — too little as a continuous and compact whole. But it is this aphoristical mode of interpretation, which has given rise to the deduction from this Epistle of those strange and false dogmas which our author so ably refutes. Difficulty ceases, mysticism vanishes, the darkest portions of this most sorely tortured book of the New Testament become lucid and instructive, when we view it as a logical argument for the establishment of a single definite point, namely, that the Gospel is not less designed and adapted for those without the Mosaic

* John xiv. 2.

law, than for those under the law, — a point, of which, even in his digressions, the Apostle never loses sight, and for the proof of which he has, at the close of his Epistle, accumulated an irresistible weight of argument. We hope that Mr. Barnes, in extending his labors to the other apostolic Epistles, will adopt more entirely Locke's principles of interpretation as a guide, and thus present to us, with more distinctness than he has done in this instance, the unity of purpose, aim, and end which is one of the most prominent, though most frequently forgotten characteristics of these Epistles.

In conclusion we would say, that, while our Orthodox brethren publish, and circulate, and receive with favor such books as these "Notes," we most cordially extend to them the right hand of fellowship, even though they refuse to return it. We regard them as fellow laborers with us for the overthrow of time-hallowed absurdities, for the cleansing of the Christian creed from "whatever defileth and maketh a lie." Calvinism is now a house divided against itself. It embraces within its walls two, not only distinct, but opposite sects, the one that of the friends, the other that of the enemies of free inquiry, — the one that of the votaries of reason, the other that of the blindfold recipients of a traditional faith. The house is tottering, is on the point of falling; and, when it falls, we confidently expect to receive into the citadel of liberal Christianity, and shall greet with a most hearty welcome, those beneath whose well-aimed blows the walls of the old mansion are shaking, and its foundations crumbling.

A. P. P.

Art. IV. — 1. *The Laws of Sobriety, and the Temperance Reform. An Address delivered before the Young Men's Temperance Society in Lowell, March 8th,* 1835. By Elisha Bartlett, M. D. Lowell. 8vo. pp. 30.

2. *An Address delivered before the Massachusetts State Temperance Society, May 31st,* 1835. By the Rev. Samuel K. Lothrop. 2d Edition. Boston: 1835. 8vo. pp. 30.

3. *Proceedings of the Temperance Convention held in Boston on the twenty-third of September, 1835, in pursuance of an Invitation of the Massachusetts Temperance Society to the Friends of Temperance; with an Address to the Friends of Temperance.* Boston: 1836. 8vo. pp. 45.

For several years we have looked with a good deal of anxiety upon the progress of the "Temperance Reform"; and we feel it our duty to inquire into its condition and prospects, and to report the circumstances which seem to favor or hinder it. The best interests of mankind are embarked in this enterprise; — are they safe, or otherwise? Are they wisely and prudently cared for, or are they endangered by rash and headlong management? A stout ship was fitted out, — but ill victualled and manned as it seemed to most for such an enterprise, — and waiting for a favoring breeze. We entered and had some small command; and at length, obtaining more supplies and men and getting out into deep water, we made rapid way, which gave promise of a successful issue. Accordingly, before the voyage was nearly completed, — no port being in sight or soundings possible, — there was a prodigious shouting and clapping of hands, as if the danger were over and the end as good as accomplished. We rejoiced with the joy of the men, — deeming it of good omen; nevertheless we had our misgivings about all this shouting and clapping of hands, as somewhat premature. We remembered the wise saying, — "Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast himself as he that putteth it off." We knew that the easiest part only of the work was done, — that difficulties and perils were yet to be encountered in unknown seas. Our fears have been verified.

We are at present in a delicate position in relation to what is called "the Temperance movement." We are no whit behind the foremost in our devotion to the object aimed at. For this object we deem no sacrifice too great, and no effort too laborious. Deep accordingly have been our sorrow and mortification at seeing the new character and direction given of late to that influence which has been working such desirable changes in the opinions and habits of society. We grieve to say, that the progress of reform is obstructed, — if not altogether brought to a stand, — not so much by the opposition of enemies, as by the indiscretion or error of well-meaning friends.

It is not then because we are indifferent to the cause, but the reverse; — it is because it is dear to us, and we see its present peril, that we venture, at some risk, to call in question the wisdom and truth of certain new ideas which are hurrying the public mind, as we think, in a false direction. There are times when it is the duty of true men, — at whatever hazard of being crushed, — to hang as a weight upon the wheels of reform. And now, when we see them whirling along, no one knows whither, with such portentous and heating velocity, we think such a time has come.

We may as well confess in the outset, that we are not generally in favor of combinations to effect good objects by public agitation. We had from the beginning our fears and misgivings about the working of the formidable machinery by which a great moral reform was to be elaborated, the rubbish of old error and vicious custom cleared away, and a new fabric of society constructed on better foundations. We discerned the elements of reform already working in the community; and we feared that they would lose somewhat of their direct and spiritual action on the minds and sympathies of men by being diverted from their natural modes of manifestation, and made undistinguishable parts and springs of this social machinery. It seemed to us that a firm, temperate, and good man, in his individual thought and free activity, had in him a moral force which must be lost or greatly impaired, when he consents to merge himself in an association, whose movements he cannot control.

For what is an association but a living machine, which yet, taken as a whole, has in it no spiritual life and unity, and can attain such only by sacrificing the minds of the many to one, or, at most, a few? And these few are commonly not the best or wisest, but coarse, violent men, whose restless activity, — or what is worse, — unflinching and unfeeling hardihood on public occasions, places them in the front rank, from which men of profound reflection are apt to retire. It is to be deplored as one of the evils incident to such combinations, that persons of the former description thrust themselves into the places of great men, and stand forth to the world as such, while the real teachers and reformers of mankind, are thrown into the back-ground.

We had, however, no doubt of the rectitude of the motives by which individuals were drawn into "concerted action" in

this cause. We reasoned simply from the known tendencies of men under like circumstances. Moving on to their object in a mass, — almost irresponsibly, — they often sustain and encourage one another in modes of operation which most of them would individually condemn. They inflame each other's zeal, — which is not always according to knowledge, — by exciting and intolerant addresses. Those who aim at some distinction, moreover, are unconsciously driven on by ambition to more vehemence and intolerance than they would else have been able to justify to their own minds. All human experience teaches us, that combinations animated by such a spirit will create hostility. Societies of this kind, instituted for any object whatever, do almost always awaken an opposition, active and violent in proportion to the zeal with which its measures are pressed. We were therefore somewhat afraid of disturbing the natural operation of social influences, and interfering with the moral power of individual, living goodness, by artificial arrangements and mechanical ways of producing effect. An immense compelling force, breaking down opposition, is substituted for that gentle, well-directed, spiritual influence, which attracts and disarms it.

An able writer in the Edinburgh Review,* several years ago, spoke of the tendency of the age to this mode of action as follows: "It is an age of machinery in every outward and inward sense of that word. Nothing is now done directly or by hand. All is by rule and calculated contrivance. Old modes of exertion are all discredited and thrown aside. On every hand the living artisan is driven from his workshop to make room for a speedier inanimate one. The shuttle drops from the hands of the weaver, and falls into iron fingers that fly it faster. The sailor furls his sail, lays down his oar, and bids a strong, unwearied servant, on vaporous wings, bear him through the waters. There is no end to machinery. Even the horse is stripped of his harness, and finds a fleet fire-horse yoked in his stead. Nay, we have an artist that hatches chickens by steam, — the very brood-hen is to be superseded!" . . . . . "Instruction, that mysterious communing of Wisdom with Ignorance, is no longer an indefinable, tentative process, requiring a study of individual aptitudes, and a perpetual variation of means and methods to attain the same

* For June, 1829. Vol. XLIX. pp. 442, 443.

end; but a secure, universal, straight-forward business, to be conducted in the gross, by proper mechanism, with such intellect as comes to hand." . . . . . "Has any man, or any society of men a truth to speak, or a piece of spiritual work to do, they can nowise proceed at once and with the mere natural organs, but must first call a public meeting, appoint committees, issue prospectuses, in a word, construct or borrow machinery wherewith to do and speak it. Then every machine must have its moving power in some of the great currents of society. Every little sect among us, Unitarians, Utilitarians, Anabaptists, Phrenologists, must each have its periodical, its monthly or quarterly magazine, hanging out like its windmill into the *popularis aura*, to grind meal for the society.

. . . . . "These things, which we state lightly enough here, are yet of deep import, and indicate a mighty change in our whole manner of existence. For the same habit regulates, not our modes of action alone, but our modes of thought and feeling. Men are grown mechanical in head and heart, as well as in hand. They have lost faith in individual endeavour, and in natural force of every kind. Not for internal perfection, but for external combinations and arrangements, for institutions and constitutions, for mechanism of one sort or another, do they hope and struggle. Their whole efforts, attachments, opinions turn on mechanism, and are of a mechanical character."

From the principle of working together to accomplish moral ends, — ascribed by this writer to the mechanical tendencies of the age, — there is doubtless good as well as evil to be expected. Many objects, such as the planting of colonies and the support of religious institutions, require funds and other aids which individuals cannot supply. Yet the remarks we have quoted are reasonable, and, — qualify them as we may, — we think there is in them a good deal of wisdom and truth. We repeat, that we have all along looked with some apprehension upon the tendency of these modern movements, that supersede private efforts, and make individuals of no account, save as they contribute to the velocity or momentum of the machinery by which great moral results are to be wrought out. With these views of the effect of combinations generally, we confess that we entered into the temperance movement at first with some reluctance, — a reluctance, however, which was soon overcome by a sense of the enormous and

unmanageable character of the evil to be contended with. The details of this evil are known to the public, and need not here be repeated. It is scarcely possible to exaggerate the amount of poverty, crime, and wretchedness, which appear on the very surface of society, as the natural fruits of intemperance. But what finite mind shall attempt to measure the secret, heartbreaking, domestic sorrow that springs from the same source! — the sorrow that sits desolate, forlorn, forsaken, and never tells her tale of wo! Our objections to associations of this kind were overcome when our attention was once awake to this obstinate, moral, social, and domestic mischief. It was the mighty power of a demon rushing through scenes of beauty and joy to blast them. Against this tremendous force the individual strength of man was indeed weakness.

A combined effort to banish the drinking of ardent spirits from the community seemed to be the more necessary, because it was a social vice, which grew out of a common error. It was necessary to disabuse the public mind of this error. Alcohol had long been held in general favor as a beverage. It was the usual offering of friendship and hospitality. It was mutually given and received as the expression of kindly and social sympathy. It was an easy and acceptable reward for trifling services, which had no pecuniary value. It was resorted to by the idle for pleasure, and by the laborious for refreshment. The field, the work-shop, the tavern, and the pleasure-party were all engaged in doing the work of public corruption. Every holiday gave to youth its lessons of sin, and strengthened the ruinous habits of riper years. Indeed, none were deemed too old or too young to enjoy the solace of this patent sustainer and restorer of nature's weakness, this sovereign balm for all "the ills that flesh is heir to." It was diluted and transformed so that children found pleasure in its sweetness, and it ministered comfort and strength to second childhood, tottering on the brink of the grave. So universally did this error work in the heart of society, that no wonder we have seen many a man, who started in the freshness of his young life full of hope and promise, soon become its victim, "wasting his substance in riotous living," then prolonging his shameful life by plunder or charity, or pining in prison among convicted felons, or perchance a maniac writhing in chains, or an idiot moping in helpless and hopeless dotage. Against this mighty social error we felt that it was necessary to bring a

combined public expression of truth. We therefore took the pledge, with strong heart and hope, and bent ourselves earnestly and with such strength as we had, to the vast moral machine.

The evil we had to contend with was traced directly to the prevalent habit of drinking ardent spirits, — drinking *moderately* we mean, for all the intemperate were once moderate drinkers, and intended to remain such. For this habit a renovation of public opinion seemed to be the only remedy. And it was proper for the friends of temperance to give a united expression to this new opinion about distilled liquors, that their use might become disreputable, and at length wholly disappear from society. The adoption of the pledge of total abstinence seemed to be the readiest way of giving expression and force to the common feeling of the friends of reform on this subject. And therefore we adopted it. We wish to have it distinctly understood, that we entered into this combination against ardent spirits, not because they were the only mischievous articles in use, and not merely because we saw in the use of them a vehement tendency to abuse. We held that liability to abuse is no just ground for total abstinence from any thing really good. These articles we did not believe to be really good as drink, but the reverse. It appeared in evidence not to be refuted, that distilled liquors, used in any quantity, are always an injurious beverage to persons in health, — that all men are better without than with them. It moreover appeared in evidence, that there was such extreme danger, not merely of hurt, but of utter ruin, in using them even moderately, that out of any ten young men, who adopted this habit, there was a moral certainty that several would be destroyed by it. We say then distinctly, that it was this *specific* evil, which we deem more deadly than war, pestilence, and famine combined, — it was against this *specific* evil, and not against any other and doubtful, or less fatal practice, that we pledged ourselves to work in the temperance combination.

We say this distinctly and repeatedly, because we still think this is the true ground, and mean to maintain it until we see good reason for giving it up. Nor do we mean to bear in silence the imputation of being "enemies," or at best "inconistent friends" of temperance, for adhering to the principle with which we started.

At this point we are in danger of parting company with many of our friends, who insist upon placing *fermented liquors* on the same footing with distilled spirits, and immediately or gradually extending to them the pledge of total abstinence. We have great objections to this course, which we will proceed to set forth with such distinctness as we can.

We object to destroying the simplicity of the obligation under which we have hitherto acted together with harmony and success. A loud outcry has been raised, that "we are making no progress." There is a party who cannot wait a reasonable time for the seed to germinate and grow after it has been sown; like the poor farmer who was found digging up his potatoes in June, because, he said, "To wait till September was a longer credit than he could afford to give." We hear such persons exclaiming, "What, shall we never advance, — shall we never get on? We came up two years ago to the pledge of total abstinence from distilled spirits! Shall we stand for ever on this old ground?" Just as if the object of the Temperance Society was, not to promote temperance, but to bring the greatest possible number of articles under the ban of the community! We ask such brethren, why we should not stand on this old ground, if it is the true ground, where we ought to work and can work with effect. We suppose that the wise projectors of this movement measure its success, not by the length and breadth to which the principle of total abstinence is extended, but by the number and fidelity of those who adopt it.

Our hope of success, as a Society, lies chiefly in the simple and specific character of the pledge. We believe it possible to convince men generally of the duty and expediency of abstaining wholly from a class of articles proved to be so pernicious in their use. But we do not believe that they can be convinced of the duty and expediency of abstaining from every thing which is pernicious merely in its *abuse*. The more you extend the pledge, the more you weaken its obligation; else why have any pledge? Are not the laws of nature and the laws of God an obligation sufficiently strong? Should a hundred men pledge themselves to abstain from all immorality of every kind, who supposes that such a vow would add any force to the obligations under which they were born? We wish to have men obey all the laws of temperance, whether in drinking or eating, or other enjoyments; but we have no faith

in the efficacy of a pledge to produce this result. On this point we recommend to our readers the excellent and discriminating address of Dr. Bartlett, which we have placed at the head of this article. In the following extracts, he shows the distinction to be made between distilled spirits, and other articles which men *may* use to their injury.

"They [the friends of temperance] saw idleness and pauperism increasing with fearful rapidity in a new country, rich in fertility and full of resources. They saw our court-houses thronged with culprits, and our county jails and State prisons crowded with miserable tenants. They saw strange fires burning on the altars of God. They saw *age* with his white locks and tottering form, *manhood* in his fullest strength, *youth* in his freshest bloom, and *beauty* in her sweetest charms, stricken down together, by a spoiler more terrible than death. The father left his offspring to perish, and the mother forgot her nursing child.

"And whence came these manifold forms of wretchedness and sin? Came they from the common violations of the *laws of sobriety?* Came they from gluttony, or from the influence of wine, or beer, or cider, or opium, or tobacco, or tea, or from all these? No! neither from *one* nor from *all.* They came from the stimulus of a more fiery drink, from a more potent poison, from a drug, which, while it consumed the body, brutalized also the mind; they came from *alcohol, distilled alcohol,* and from this *alone.* They came from it *then,* they come from it *now.*

"The evils resulting from the use of distilled drinks differ both in kind and degree from those occasioned by any other inebriating or stimulating substance in nature. They stand in their enormity alone and unapproachable. This manifest and indisputable difference between the effects of alcohol on the one hand, and the exhilarating substances which have been enumerated, on the other, points out at once the necessary difference in the proper methods of removing their respective and appropriate ills. In the one case I allude to wine, beer, cider, opium, tobacco, tea, coffee, and other similar articles; their peculiar properties should be pointed out fully, honestly, faithfully, to each being adjudged its due share of good and its appropriate ills, for there is, in this respect, an enormous difference among them. People should know the effects which each of these articles produces on the human system. They should be made familiar with the *Laws of Temperance* in all their length and breadth; the health and happiness, the vigor of body and cheerful activity of mind, which are the natural fruits of their observance; and the inevitable suffering attendant on their violation. The kindly voice of warning and admonition may urge ever so warmly, the obligations, both of interest and duty, which

bind men to obedience to these divinely instituted laws, and there the matter should stop.

* * * * *

"I say, then, that in the enormity of the evils resulting from the unrestrained use of ardent spirits, in their fatal influence upon all our civil, social, and political blessings, in their general relation to pauperism and crime, consists the essential and immense difference between them and all other substances. I insist upon this distinction. I believe it to be founded in truth, and that a correct understanding of it is all-important to the progress and ultimate victory of 'the Temperance Cause.'

"If, by identifying our opposition to the use of distilled liquors, with opposition to *all* violations of the laws of Temperance, the former can be made more speedily and entirely successful, then I have nothing to say. But, if the distinction which I insist upon is correct, this merging of opposition to alcohol in general opposition to all stimulating and inebriating substances is impracticable, and cannot be made without endangering or retarding the success of *the* Temperance Cause. It seems to me that among the friends of this great moral, social, civil, and national interest, there should be unity of design, singleness of purpose, harmony of operation.

"Until, then, the use of *wine*, or beer, or tobacco, or tea leads to the results produced by alcohol, they cannot properly be opposed on precisely the same grounds, nor with precisely the same weapons. And that these articles *do not produce* the same evils, seems to me abundantly evident.

* * * * *

"Health may sometimes be injured, and bad passions may sometimes be excited by wine; but it differs from alcohol, in *kind* as well as in *degree*, in its operation on the system, both corporeal and mental; and neither the magnitude nor the nature of its ill effects is such as to interfere with the *general welfare*."—pp. 9 – 13.

We object most decidedly to the movements of those friends of temperance who labor to destroy the simplicity of the pledge, and confound the distinction so properly stated by Dr. Bartlett. While this distinction was kept in view, great progress was made towards producing a general conviction, that ardent spirits were not only more injurious and dangerous than any other drinks, but were altogether unfit for such use, — in fact the main cause of intemperance, — "the whole head and front of the offending." On the strength of this conviction, the reformation made most encouraging progress, — multitudes being found willing to abstain from a specific article which was

so clearly proved to be unfit for a beverage. And they did it with the distinct persuasion, that all other liquors in use were not only comparatively safe and innocent, but altogether different in *kind* from those which they had been prevailed upon to reject. The friends of temperance had all along taught them that fermented drinks were not to be classed with ardent spirits, nor opposed on the same grounds and with the same arguments. In the mean time, the influence of the Association was nowise confined within this limit. The laws of the animal economy were expounded, and in connexion with them the great duty of self-denial and moderation in all the gratifications of the appetites and senses. Every thing, especially, which contained the intoxicating element, was carefully examined, and its effects and proper uses explained. Men began to see with new clearness of vision, that the demon of Intemperance was lurking amongst all their luxuries, and required careful watching and resolute resistance. So far every thing was working well for thorough reform. The public mind become more and more firmly established in what we regard as the true doctrine, namely, *that it is our duty to abstain wholly from that of which the use is evil, and abstain from all abuse of that in which excess is evil.* This we still believe is the only principle on which the reformation, so auspiciously begun, can be successfully carried on. We believe it to be the only efficacious principle because it is the only *true* principle.

When we commence a war of extermination against any thing which affects the habits or interests of the people, we are bound to show wherein and how that matter has wrought such mischief to the people, as to justify a public and general combination against it. In this matter of intemperance, what is the cause? What agents have done the frightful mischief? Was it disobedience to the laws of temperance generally? Was it gluttony? — was it luxury? — was it the drinking of wine, beer, cider, coffee, or tea, that filled our dwellings with broken hearts, our streets with reeling drunkards, and our alms-houses and prisons with paupers and felons? Nothing like this has happened. There was doubtless intemperance, and sorrow, and sin, among those who were not spirit-drinkers; with these we have much to do as Christians and friends of humanity, — but they were, for the most part, private evils, attracting no public notice and requiring no public combination

to suppress them. The following remarks on this topic, extracted from Mr. Lothrop's valuable and temperate address, — the second referred to at the head of this article, — deserve to be well considered.

"There will be wisdom in not introducing abstinence from wines and all intoxicating liquors into the pledge of Temperance Societies; I say in *not introducing it into the pledge.* I do not say that there would not be wisdom in every man's abstaining from these; though I am not certain that there would. That there is a wide-marked, palpable difference between alcohol separated and alcohol existing as a component part of some other substance, — between distilled spirits and all other liquors, cannot be denied. Distillation is entirely a process of art; fermentation is entirely a process of nature; and the results of these processes are as distinct as their origin. All distilled liquors are a class by themselves. They find no sympathy at any time, in health or in sickness, with any part of the animal system. Nothing within us will unite with them, nothing coöperate with them; every organ and every function of the body rejects them, and the brain that has been maddened by them, is obliged at last to permit their collection, pure, and unmixed, upon its upper surface. With pure and simple fermented liquors this is not the case. These, when occasionally used, at proper times and in proper quantities, are beneficial; at least I have never seen it proved that they were injurious when thus taken. When received into the stomach, they submit to its action. They pass through the various processes of digestion, incorporate with the various juices and secretions which those processes engender, and are thus diffused over the system, and impart their share of strength and nourishment to the whole. In the things themselves, therefore, there is a wide and essential difference, and in their effects. The smallest portion of alcohol, separated by distillation, never does any good, but always injury to the system, and will not unite with any part of it. A proper portion of fermented liquor is subjected to the digestive functions, is changed in its character and qualities, and by mingling with its various juices, is made a component and healthful part of the system. Against any and all use of the one, therefore, the argument is clear, direct, consistent, undeniable in all its premises, irresistible in its conclusion. In favor of entire abstinence from the other, the same argument cannot be made out. Indeed it is not, I believe, attempted. In the one case, the argument is drawn from the very nature of the substance; in the other, from the superadded qualities, and from a view of the relative conditions of society. The only two reasons that I have heard advanced, for embracing all intoxicating liquors in the pledge are, that most of these are adulterated,

containing, among other deleterious substances, a large proportion of alcohol, and that, unless the better conditioned classes in the community will relinquish these, you cannot call upon the poor to give up the other; unless the rich will abstain from their wines, which they *can* purchase, the poor will not abstain from their rum, which is *all* they can purchase. With regard to the first of these reasons, it avails on the score of health, but not on the score of temperance. We may call upon a man to give up *adulterated* wines, because they are *adulterated*, but not because they are *wines*. In proportion as these, or cider, or beer can be obtained *pure*, they may be drank in such quantities as health or refreshment may require. They can be, by some, obtained in a great degree pure; they ought not therefore to be embraced in the same pledge, and placed upon the same footing, with that which always, in its very nature, so far as man's system is concerned, is *impure*.

* * * * *

"But I am not advocating the use of wine, or beer, or cider. There is too much of these drank by rich and poor, young and old, those who are idle, and those who toil; and he who uses them habitually and freely, is an intemperate man, though he has never approached within a fathom's length of a state of intoxication; just as he who is strictly a cold-water drinker, may be an intemperate man, and dig his own grave by gluttony, if not by wine-bibbing. And let all this be distinctly urged upon the community. Let the evils of intemperance from any cause be pointed out, and the sin of it, however indulged, rebuked. Let all the knowledge that can be gathered upon the subject of intemperance, the nature, qualities, and effects of the various drinks that produce intoxication, and the adulterations of them, that are said to be, and without doubt are, extensively practised, let this knowledge be widely, universally circulated through the community. There is no objection, among this people, to inquiry upon any point; but there is objection to assertion and requisition, without the stern argument of facts, or without these facts having been sufficiently long before the public, to be extensively known and clearly apprehended and felt. When we have this same stern argument of facts, as strong with regard to wines and all fermented liquors, as it is in relation to distilled spirit, — when it shall have been proved with respect to the first as clearly and undeniably as it has been with respect to the last, that their use, when pure and in the smallest quantities, is unnecessary and always injurious, — and when the state of the community shall show that the abuse in the one case, is equally as unavoidable and inseparable from the use, as in the other, — then it will be time to call upon the community to include all intoxicating liquors in the pledge; and when this has been proved, the community will be ready to include them, but not before. Before the points to which

I have alluded have been proved, and they certainly have not been yet, before it shall be proved, not that wine, and cider, and beer can intoxicate, and that some men drink them to excess, but that their use, when pure and in the smallest quantities, is injurious, and their general and almost universal abuse is a necessary consequence of their use (for this is the nature and force of the argument against distilled spirit), before this has been proved, there seems to be an objection to introducing them into the pledge, and making them in any manner, the principle upon which the combination is formed.— pp. 22 – 25.

We beg to be understood, that we are not advocates for the habit of drinking fermented liquors, but for the liberty of doing so. We believe that their common use is generally unnecessary and often hurtful, especially to the young, whose constitutions require no stimulants. Most of us had better abstain from them altogether, or drink them very sparingly. With this use of them truth obliges us to say, that we do not think it proper to interfere; for we have no evidence that they have done, or are likely to do, such mischief as to justify us in classing them with ardent spirits as poisons, and denouncing them on the same grounds. We believe they have an innocent use, ay, a salutary use sometimes; and their production through a process of God's own working, fermentation, does really seem to give us a hint that he designed them under certain circumstances for the refreshment of his creatures. But we do not attach much importance to this consideration. All we ask is the liberty of doing as we think right touching this subject matter, and leaving all others the freedom to abstain from as many articles as they please, without demur on our part. And we think this position ought to satisfy all who are interested in the question one way or the other.

We object again to the extension of the pledge to fermented liquors, because it assumes a false principle. On this subject we will take the broadest ground of opposition to those advocates of temperance with whom we are at issue. We believe that every human appetite, faculty, and sense was made by our Creator to be an instrument of enjoyment. And it is his will that each of these should yield us the utmost pleasure which it is capable of affording. This is found in abstinence from things hurtful, and strict temperance in all things. It is dear-bought pleasure, that which is obtained by excess; for the laws of nature are stern and inexorable, and will punish every

violator of them with sorrow, pain, and shame. These laws of the human constitution, physical, organic, or moral, are the laws which the Creator impressed upon it to bind us to our duty and our happiness. They do not require us to abstain entirely from every thing, which might hurt us by its excessive use, — much less to bind ourselves and others by vows to that effect. With regard to the use of such articles, as may be innocently enjoyed or sinfully abused, the judgment and conscience of every man should be left free. We believe, moreover, that it is the office of the moral faculty to preside over, and restrain within proper limits, all the enjoyments of appetite and sense, that nothing unworthy of an immortal and spiritual being may be done. By this conflict and striving of the spirit against the senses and passions is the great moral result of life wrought out, so that our lower propensities are the instruments of virtue as well as of pleasure. We do not believe that it is well for us to interfere on a large scale with these divine arrangements, by which man is ordained to pass through self-control, and trial, and victory, to spiritual strength and glory. We would deprive him entirely of nothing but what is in its nature hurtful; — for the rest, it is better to leave him to his discretion and his conscience, to the warnings of his fellow men, and "the wisdom that cometh from above." This we think is the true philosophy of life, in which whoso walks and works, and manfully resists temptation, shall attain to well-doing and well-being; for he obeys the laws which God has written upon his nature. He has obtained the victory of faith. And we think he has reached a far higher and nobler developement of his being, than is possible to him who retires in the morning from the great struggle of the day, and entrenches his weakness by vows of total abstinence from every thing in which temptation resides. From all certain moral evil he should keep himself aloof; but from a contest with possible evil he must not always shrink. It is doubtful indeed whether even safety is best provided for by multiplying the pledges of abstinence from the various pleasures of life; for the passions, sternly restrained in so many directions, will burn with greater intenseness within, and rush with resistless violence to any weak or unguarded point where they can break out into sin. We think that the disciples of the ascetic philosophy which is antagonist to ours overlook these principles of our nature. They see no social, domestic, and moral uses in

the wants and propensities of our animal constitution; at best, they seem to them but provisions for the support of life. And, in their view, none of these lower pleasures, — which spring from the animal constitution, and are refined and multiplied by that very civilization which a desire for them contributed largely to create, — none of these are of any worth. No matter how much they are narrowed down, — no matter how stern and entire is the mortification of the animal; nor how rudely the fine tissue of associations, which cluster round our social and domestic pleasures, is torn away. So man is sufficiently mortified and life made painful enough to him, no matter whether he is restrained from that which is innocent, or that which is wrong. They would chain him up, that he may not abuse his free activity, — they would bind him by vows, that he may go not where temptation may prevail over him, — they would cut him off from the world, lest he should become the victim of its allurements. Now we do not believe, that this mode of being accords with the laws of God. We believe He delights in multiplying our enjoyments through our free choice of good. The restraint he imposes is not from without, but from an inward, spiritual, invisible law. We would not therefore bind our fellow men by mechanical restraints in things indifferent; but endeavour to give strength and supremacy to this inward law of life, in obedience to which they will avoid what is evil in its own nature, and commit no sin in that which is hurtful by inordinate indulgence. We think not less highly of self-denial than the most ascetic of philosophers; but we would not have it misdirected; nor would we concentrate it all into one act of unrequired renunciation; we would not make it a substitute for the spiritual endeavour and struggle of a dutiful life. We would arm ourselves with its power to meet all real occasions, and such will not be wanting to call it forth.

We would not, then, needlessly interfere with the liberty of our fellow men, nor narrow down their enjoyments for the sake of keeping them out of the way of temptation. Let them have a clear range, and take the hazards of life, and do battle manfully with its trials and temptations, clothed with principles which shall be armour of proof. It may be easier to renounce once and for ever all gratifications from which sin may possibly spring; but it is not therefore better. In every thing not absolutely hurtful, as ardent spirits are, let each man abstain; but let it be voluntary abstinence, the result of his

own convictions. These principles, which we think sound, are violated by those who would compel their fellow men to abstain wholly from every article which is hurtful in its abuses, or, what is the same in principle, embitter the enjoyment of such article by inflaming public opinion against it. We cannot go along with them in this matter, — we cannot consent to enter into a crusade against any luxury, be it of drink or food, until it is shown to be a great public evil. And we have a right to complain of those who are striving to place other substances on the same footing with distilled spirits, asserting that they are equally bad, when they are not equally bad. We say that this is a false principle and no good can come of it.

The course of which we complain is defended partly by interminable disquisitions on the properties of wine, cider, beer, and so forth, which convince us not, and partly by round assertion, which is little or no better except as it is shorter. "The Sir Walter Scott of the temperance cause," — we like this euphonious appellative, and suppose he does, as it was given him by a friend, not in irony, but the reverse, — "the Sir Walter Scott of the temperance cause" has said a good many things about wine, &c., which we shall hold for apocryphal until farther advised. He asserts, among other matters, that there is an enormous amount of intemperance among the French people, who make wine a common beverage. "Though never absolutely intoxicated, they are all burnt up, frenzied, wrought up to the point of battle, by the small wine of the country." If this is the fact it is pretty evident that they drink too much of it, and we are sorry for it; it is a grievous fault. But, inasmuch as we are acting for our own countrymen, and not for Frenchmen, we do not see that we can do any thing about it. We have, however, a word or two to say to this matter. The French, we are told, use their wine with breakfast and supper, as well as for dinner and by-drinkings. Since they make so free with such a potent and dangerous article, we marvel greatly that they are "never quite intoxicated," — "always up to the point of battle," without overgoing it, — "strong without rage, without o'erflowing full." They must be a careful people, these Frenchmen! An American so using wine, if it is half as bad as it has been charged with being, would be drunk, — yes, drunk all his life. Our countrymen, however, will never use wine in this free way, we think. Why, the veriest toper you can find, would flout

at a Frenchman's breakfast, his pint of sour wine and a piece of bread, unless the new theories of living first compel him to give up his comfortable cup of coffee or tea, which our poorest families *yet* enjoy without much molestation! But we have somewhat more to say about French intemperance. It is even worse than has been stated. French people, a good many of them, do get "*quite intoxicated*"; but by what means chiefly? By the unspeakable quantities of brandy and rum drank by those who do not choose wine! Have you ever seen an account of the spirit shops of Paris, to which the intemperate habitually resort? They may vie with the very "gin palaces" of London for number and magnificence! It were well to inquire whether some of the French intemperance does not come out of these!

We had written so far when we received a copy of an "Address from the Council of the Massachusetts Temperance Society to the Friends of Temperance," appended to the record of proceedings at the late convention in Boston. In this address, which is so good that we would gladly extract a great part of it, we find a strong confirmation, from high authority, of what we have just been saying. We select the following passages.

"It is argued, that fermented liquors are as injurious, if not more so, than are distilled ones, in regard to the health of man. The answer to this is found altogether in experience; and what does experience teach? Wine, in the first place, is digested as are other alimentary drinks; it forms direct combination with other digested masses, and enters with them, at once, into the circulation, and subserves, with them, the great purposes of alimentation and nutrition. It is amenable to the laws of the economy. It is not a poison. It neither alters nor destroys the organization of the stomach, the liver, the blood-vessels, or the brain."

"How has it been with men taken in masses, men who have always used wine, and many of whom before the temperance movements used brandy, whiskey, &c., as a common or daily drink? Do these, it is asked, furnish the instances of drunkenness which have been produced by the moderate use of fermented liquors? But go still farther, go to the wine countries; France, for instance, and how stands the matter there? Some very curious facts have lately reached us in regard to France. It seems, that within a few years, the time is dated at or a little before the beginning of the reform here, that the people of France had gradually given up the use of wine as a common, every-day, and every-meal drink, and

have since fallen into the habit of drinking distilled liquors, and from that time intemperance has appeared in the country, and is now making most alarming progress. In other words, giving up the old and free use of wine, and substituting the use of brandy, has brought upon the nation a curse never before known. This it is, which has led to the earnest appeals, which have been lately made to us, to lend our aid in suppressing this vast and growing evil. — pp. 26, 27.

Now what inference shall we draw from evidence like this? That the use of wine is the great cause of intemperance, or the reverse? It seems that the French were formerly a temperate people in the main, while they adhered to their fermented liquor, though they drank it somewhat more freely than we can approve. We think that they would have done well to substitute water or tea and coffee, if they could afford them, for a considerable part of this wine. They did otherwise it seems, and did worse, they took to brandy; and the result is, a fearful, wide-spreading, brutal intemperance! And yet gentlemen pathetically call upon us to denounce all fermented drinks, which have done little harm here, for the sake of saving poor Frenchmen, who are ruined by forsaking them! Verily this is too much! We should not dare to banish all fermented liquors, if we could, from any country, being well assured that the perverse ingenuity of man would devise something worse. The truth of the matter is, that fermented liquors, occasionally or moderately used, though hurtful to some, are nowise to be classed with distilled spirits in respect to pernicious qualities. And so are cider and beer, tea and coffee, and many other things hurtful to some persons, and such should avoid them. The temperance law is, that every man should entirely abstain from that which is injurious to him, be it food or drink; but let him not hastily infer that it will hurt every body else, and go about to deprive his neighbours of what may be to them an innocent indulgence. We will work earnestly against *the* enormous acknowledged evil that stares us in the face wherever we go, and hold ourselves, not exactly "wrought up to the point of battle," but ready to contend heartily, and with such force as we can, against others, whenever they show themselves to be such. Meanwhile we think there is somewhat to complain of in the conduct of those, who endeavour to supersede this true principle by another which is not true.

We have cause, we say, to complain not only of the thing

done, but of the way of doing it. There is a manifestation of bad taste and bad temper, which is working offence, opposition, discord, and all manner of evils. Many are disgusted by the slang which some of the advocates of temperance deem it fit to utter in its behalf; many more are driven from us by what they call a persecuting spirit, though it is in fact the effect of indiscreet zeal. It has been our misfortune to hear some lectures on this subject, which were so utterly abominable that no Christian people ought to listen to them. With some sprinklings of bitter invective to season it withal, the main body of the discourse consisted of a tissue of coarse and brutal gibes, as if, forsooth, the utter ruin of a fellow creature, — body, estate, and soul, — were an exceedingly good joke! There has been somewhat too much of this. We remember with what pain and disquiet we once witnessed the desecration of a church by an address which was nothing else than a shameful and long-spun parody of a Scripture story, in which "one David Coldwaterman," figured in a vigorous campaign, ending in complete victory over an ominous raw head and bloody bones of a giant, who bore the cacophonous appellation of "Rumbacchus." Such matter, which is nothing else than a new revelation of vulgarity and slang, is enough to throw discredit on any cause.

But let the coarseness pass. The spirit of denunciation also alienates many from the cause. Two conditions are necessary to the production of a good moral effect. The teacher must be able to place a spiritual truth fairly before the mind of the hearer, and the latter must bring his mind into a state to receive it, that is, — in this "mysterious communing of wisdom with ignorance," of truth with error, of light with darkness, — there must be a sympathy created between the two minds, or there will be no persuasion wrought, and no reformation will ensue. No spiritual good is ever received until the want of it is felt; the supply, however abundant, will be useless, unless there be a demand for it. If the advocate of temperance cannot create this demand, cannot secure the cooperation of his hearer, he can do nothing to the purpose. If we go forth with mocking and denunciations to do battle with makers, venders, and drinkers of ardent spirits or other matters, we make them enemies at once, enemies not the less vehement because we show them to be in the wrong, for men do not like to be put in the wrong by those whom they hate. If

we begin by calling a man hard names, or knocking him down, we cut him off completely from our sympathies, and set up a barrier over which our influence cannot pass. If you think that dealers in noxious articles are "murderers" and "worse than murderers," you had better not say so in terms, but prove the fact, and let them make the application according to their special tastes. There is little logic and less persuasion in hard names or hard knocks.

But we object farther, that those who insist upon denouncing all fermented liquors, are intolerant towards the old and staunch friends of the temperance cause, and their speeches and movements threaten a division in our ranks. The Society is on the point of being divided against itself. For a good while past, the advocates of ultra measures have been carrying on a civil war against those who conscientiously adhere to the original pledge and doctrine; and thus the latter are driven to the alternative of bearing reproach and affronting insinuations in silence, or of appearing in the false position of opposers to the movement. We called it a civil war, technically. But we have heard a good deal that was somewhat less than civil. We were present as a delegate at the Boston convention, and were astonished and grieved by the tone of intolerance, — nay, insolence, which prevailed to a great extent among what we must call, by way of distinction, the *ultra* party. There were many honorable exceptions certainly; nor do we mean to question the good intentions of those whose bearing we disapprove. In the first place, we think it was a crafty and unfair proceeding, to say the least, to force through the convention, *vi et armis*, a string of printed resolutions cut from a New York paper, and call it an "expression of public sentiment in Massachusetts." But what was worse, the arguments of those who were not in favor of these resolutions, if perchance they could obtain a hearing, were met by sneers, and sarcasms, and ungentlemanly insinuations about their private habits! The cause of temperance then and there received a wound which will not soon be healed. Many members who have this cause deeply at heart, left that convention with a firm persuasion that no fair expression of public opinion, except by great good luck, can ever be had from a body like that; and with a resolution moreover never more to appear in such company. How often, in the course of that unhappy session, did we hear it asserted, directly and indirectly, in almost every form of refined

or coarse vituperation, that the firm friends of the original principle of total abstinence were "the worst enemies of the cause"; and that too, not because they *drank* fermented liquors themselves, but because they were unwilling to enter into a combination to deprive mankind of their use, by making it, first disgraceful, then penal.

We remarked especially the ground taken by one gentleman, who has labored abundantly for temperance. And we were grieved to remark, that, in his warm defence of favorite theories, he quite overlooked the fact, that other men might have opinions, rights, or feelings, entitled to respect. His zeal against wine seemed to have eaten him up, at least his discretion and charity. One would think that he had a knowledge of some hidden malignity in the article, of which mankind are not aware. And *deacons* too he hates nearly as bad. It is amazing how he persecutes this class of our fellow creatures, introducing them and turning them into ridicule on all occasions; though, for aught that appears to us, they are as harmless as most men. Why not say a word now and then about *church-wardens*?

The most plausible ground taken by the advocates for extending the pledge to fermented liquors is, not that it is our *duty* to abstain from them, but that it is *expedient* so to abstain, for the sake of example to others. Giving up all pretence to principle in this matter, and acting from a coarse expediency, they have not yet given up their intolerance. They insist most strenuously, that those who will not go along with them in their views are "inconsistent, unworthy members," whose influence is not favorable to temperance, but the reverse. We are required, under pain of denunciation, to abandon a true principle for the sake of what they call expediency, and what we deny to be such. They wish to hurry on the reformation by organizing more machinery, and making its activity more intense. They would bring its greatest possible force to bear, not upon distilled spirits which have done such mischief, but upon whatever *may* do it,— not upon what *has produced* intemperance by the natural result of moderate drinking, but upon whatever *can* produce it by immoderate drinking! The main argument by which they would convince us of this expediency is thus stated and refuted by the Council in their "Address."

"The friends of the question say, that the moderate or immoderate drinker of distilled liquors will not be very ready to give up his rum or his brandy, while the temperate man drinks his glass of wine. This argument has been much urged, and this circumstance is among its claims to regard. Stated simply, it stands thus: A is in the daily habit of doing what he, and all who are acquainted with him, know is alike ruinous to his soul and to his body, — which is not only thus ruinous to himself, but which is inflicting unmixed evil and misery upon those most nearly connected with him. This habit is rum-drinking. B is in the daily but moderate habit of drinking wine. A says he will not break his vicious, ruinous habit, unless B promises, pledges himself to total abstinence from wine, and even finds support for his gross intemperance in this habit or custom of his neighbour. Now the opponent of the *wine question* asks if there be any truth in any portion of the statement just made. Is it, not probable, but is it not impossible that any drunkard, awakened to a sense of his whole danger, of the poverty, the disease, and the disgrace he was bringing upon himself and his family, could, for a moment, suspend his decision upon the question, whether another man would give up drinking wine, or forego a questionable or even any the most vicious habit. The very supposition is absurd on the face of it. Who that has a sense of virtue would look round for a price for which to practise it? What has my virtue to gain or to lose from all else in the whole universe? By what tenure can I hold it, but by the still, small voice within me, which is more than the echo of that which speaks from heaven?" — pp. 28, 29.

We do not think this cavil is worthy of any attention, except from the extreme importance attached to it by the friends of ultra measures, — and they may well overestimate its cogency, inasmuch as it is a creature of their own making. We have never heard it from the class who are supposed to be injuriously affected by it.

If they do make use of such reasoning, it is because it is put into their mouths by temperance advocates. The mischief, whatever it be, is their work. If you can convince your intemperate brother that his habit is sin, misery, utter ruin to him and his, and make him feel this conviction of his guilt and danger, will he still persist in this habit merely because you will not promise to abstain from wine? Or if you have persuaded him on this ground, will such a slender thread of motive hold him a single day to temperance, against the strong impulse of his appetites, when the awful personal considera-

tions which bear on the question have no power over him? Will your promising or not promising to abstain from fermented liquors be an element in making up his mind whether he will be saved or lost? We are almost ashamed to notice an argument like this; but we are driven to it in self-defence. We have no belief that men, otherwise disposed to become temperate, are ever hindered in this way. They tell us that we cannot consistently ask a laboring man to give up his rum, unless we pledge ourselves to give up wine. Why? Because he will turn upon you and say, "If I could afford wine, such as rich men drink, I should be willing to do without rum." An utter *non sequitur*; but we do not disgrace the poor man by calling him the author of it; for it had other parentage. The argument assumes, that the friends of temperance ask the poor man to resign a *comfort*, to sacrifice a *real good*, without an equivalent; and we cannot consistently ask him to do this, unless we are willing to pay him for it by making a corresponding sacrifice on our part. Now the truth is, we ask him to give up what is *hurtful* to him, only, entirely, and in all respects hurtful; and if we cannot convince him that it is so, we do not expect to *buy* him over. That is not the principle on which we proceed. This argument assumes, that the members of Temperance Societies are chiefly rich men, who might, at least, possibly enter into a conspiracy against the comforts of the poorer classes; whereas it is notoriously the fact, that more than nine tenths of all such members are poor men themselves. Besides, the friends of temperance, be they poor or rich, have done what example requires. They have done precisely what they ask others to do, namely, pledged themselves to abstain from distilled spirits. Now, it will not do to say that the wealthier part of society gave up nothing. We know to the contrary. We know that, among us, they loved their spirit as well, and used it as freely, as their poorer neighbours. Nor have they made wine a substitute; it is less used than before. Furthermore we say, that if the poorest men will give up their rum, they can afford as much good fermented liquor as, in any case, it may be for their advantage or comfort to drink. But little is needed, and that little will cost much less than they now waste in intemperance. The poor man who is supposed to resort to this cavil is just as reasonable, as if he should say to his wealthier neighbour, "I should not need spirits if I could afford a good, warm, well-furnished house, with coal fires and

carpets: give up these comforts, and I will give up my rum." If this argument has any weight, it is equally strong against any expenditure of the rich above what the poor can afford. Now such expenditure may be wrong, or otherwise; but, as a Temperance Society, we have nothing to do with it. We are grieved that gentlemen should give so much countenance to this cavil in their public addresses; for it is an appeal to the lowest radicalism, which looks with a malignant jealousy on whatever there is of wealth, refinement, or elevation in the community.

Such is the great argument of expediency, for which we are asked to sacrifice — we say not a private indulgence, but what we regard as the *true principle* of moral reformation. We deny this expediency altogether. We deny that men will become temperate any more because Mr. Such-a-one knocks his cask of Madeira in the head. Jonathan does not drink gin because Jotham drinks Champagne or Madeira, but because he, the said Jonathan, loves gin. If any man continues a hard drinker on such ground as this, unmoved by all that has been said and done to expose and discountenance the practice, we believe that he would continue a hard drinker at any rate.

What, after all, is the character of wine-drinking in this country, about which such an outcry is raised? There are, no doubt, a considerable number of persons who are intemperate in the use of fermented liquors. We neither deny nor extenuate the fact. We lament it. We mean not to say that it is better than any other kind of intemperance, except as it is confined within narrow limits, and is, for the most part, a private sin, entailing private suffering only, attracting little public notice, and requiring no public action. There is a small class of dissipated young men, who herd together and drink costly wines to great excess. Would such probably be better if they were deprived of them? Would they not find other means of riot and debauchery; or are these the sort of persons to be reached by any pledges which we can adopt? You may talk of making the use of wine disgraceful; such use *is always* disgraceful. In a few instances these profligates become heads of families, and continue intemperate wine-drinkers; but the instances are so rare, that we cannot recall the names of any within our knowledge. These occasional excesses in the use of wine, — because they are occasional

only, — do not, like the habitual, daily tippling of spirits, often grow into confirmed intemperance. The next and most numerous class who drink wine are among the most eastimable of our citizens, — producing a smaller proportion of inebriates than any other class of society. With them, it is an article of fashion or luxury which custom sanctions. It does not appear except at the dinner table, and then is used, if at all, very sparingly and, for the most part, apparently without injury. How different is this practice from the guzzling of ardent spirits from morning till night! Will any one pretend to place them on a level? There is one more class of men who use fermented liquors, — the only one for whose sake the pledge can reasonably be extended. These are the few intemperate persons who have been so far affected by the temperance measures, as to abandon spirits, without getting rid of intemperate propensities, or obtaining moral force enough to restrain them. They go to the places where the means of indulgence are to be had, and endeavour to satisfy their burning appetite for stimulating drinks by strong beer or wine, or any abomination that comes to hand, which is made to do service in the character of wine. Such specimens of reformed inebriates are likely to appear in all Temperance Societies where a good deal of interest has been awakened. We know several of them. They are not reformed; they have no inward principle of temperance; they have attempted a reform which they have not virtue enough to carry through to a result. They are not worse than they were before, when they drank spirits, — a good many of them not so bad. But of most of them it may be truly said, we possess no means of reclaiming them except by producing a general change of character. If the pledge of total abstinence covered all fermented liquors, they would refuse to take it, or, taking it, would soon fall away for want of steady principle to resist the cravings of an unconquered appetite. We see nothing, then, in the use of fermented liquors, in this country, to render a public combination against them reasonable or expedient.

But we will go farther and meet the argument of expediency, by showing that the measure is *inexpedient*, inasmuch as it diverts the attention of the advocates of temperance to a wrong object and menaces a division in our ranks. Those who persist in running on a false scent will soon find themselves alone and unsupported. They are undoing what we have been toiling

for years to do, — that is, to establish the fact and impress on the public mind the conviction that ardent spirits are the chief cause of the unutterable distress in various forms, which intemperance brings upon the community. This great object was well nigh accomplished by the united and judicious efforts of the friends of humanity, and we were rejoicing in the prospect of ultimate deliverance from a great national sin. Presently, many voices are heard rising above the throng, and spreading over the land, warning the people that they have labored in vain. Earnest advocates of temperance, — excellent men, doubtless, but with more zeal than judgment, — come forward with new discoveries, as they think, get possession of the public ear and the public press, and declare that it is not ardent spirits, but wine, beer, cider, and so forth, that have done the mighty mischief; many not hesitating to assert, that "fermented drinks are worse than distilled," and, consequently, the established principle of the reformation is false! If they succeed in obtaining credit for this assertion, we verily believe that multitudes who now abstain from spirits, on the old principle, will return to them again. Nor shall we marvel thereat; for they will do it logically. They will tell us, in justification of the deed, "We have been deceived into taking your pledge, because you and others made us believe that distilled spirits were poisonous drinks, — worse than all other articles. But now these other gentlemen have convinced us that your statements were not true: spirits are no worse than a great many other drinks in common use, and so we take to the whiskey again."

We have heard it declared, and that too by a man who appeared to be serious, that all the intemperance in the world for several thousand years before the art of distilling was known, was caused by liquors not distilled! We believe it. We have no doubt that there was a good deal of gross excess among the ancient Greeks, Jews, and Romans, especially the last. But what can we do about it? It is in vain for the Massachusetts, or even the American Temperance Society to think of reforming these old, desperate topers; it is too late! In the mean time, the public mind is puzzled and misled, and the new measures are in a fair way of undoing the good work which the pioneers in the reform had so well done.

We formed a Society to destroy the foxes which had been doing a good deal of mischief in the neighbourhood, set a price

on their heads, and well nigh succeeded in exterminating the vermin. We had thinned off their numbers, and were hunting down the skulking stragglers that remained, when a loud outcry is heard ringing through the woods; "What are you about there? These are not the creatures that did the mischief among the poultry! The rabbits and squirrels did it; hunt them down, and let alone the foxes." So the chase after rabbits and squirrels grew hot and eager, but with indifferent success, the apparatus not being fit for that sort of game. Meanwhile the foxes, having a free run, began to take courage and increase and multiply according to their wont. The hunters, being discouraged, for the most part gave over and turned back; the foremost still press on to see what will come of it. We submit to them, however, when we can obtain a hearing, whether they had not better kill off the foxes first, as originally proposed by the Society, that we may know distinctly what kind of creatures have been carrying off our chickens. And then, if the robbing still goes on, we pledge ourselves to join them in exterminating the vermin, be they what they may. The very household cat shall have no mercy, if found guilty. But as the case now stands, we will go no farther, nor will a great part of our company, until we are more sure that these are really the delinquents. We say, then again, that it is inexpedient to press the *ultra* measures, because it cannot be done without creating a divison among the advocates of temperance. If our too zealous friends determine to go on, they must part company with us. We cannot consent to agitate the public mind about an evil which it hardly sees or feels, and which, at worst, is confined within a small private circle, not likely to be reached by any united endeavour on our part. For those who have been intemperate, we believe the only remedy to be depended upon is *total abstinence from every thing that can intoxicate:* we will go with the foremost in insisting on cold water for such. And we are persuaded, from what we know of them, that they will adopt this remedy as readily under the present system as under any other. If they are sincerely desirous of reformation, they will adopt the means of reformation which we all agree in prescribing. But we have small hope of making many genuine converts from this class; our chief power is to prevent.

We repeat, that if total abstinence from all fermented liquors is insisted upon, as the only condition by which one can be

deemed a consistent and honorable friend of temperance, then they who insist upon it, and reproach others for dissenting from their opinion, must go on alone. This state of things cannot continue; justice to ourselves will not allow us to act with men who publicly declare that we are the "worst enemies and the greatest hindrance" to the cause we have so much at heart. But the cause itself we will not abandon: if a rupture must come, we are sorry for it, but we cannot help it. After it has come, — after the warnings of wise and good men, men too who drink no wine or strong drink, — warnings like those contained in the letter of Dr. Miller, have been set at nought, then the *ultra* men will find themselves a small party in the community. And however estimable their characters, however pure their motives, they will be a minority too inconsiderable to control public opinion on this subject. And how will such a consummation suit the views of those among us who believe that the final blow is to be given to intemperance by legislation? Can a small minority, respectable as it may be, whose views are not borne out by the general mind, hope to procure or sustain a law, which is to press directly on the habits and appetites of the people, and make their indulgence penal? Or, should such a law be possible in the case supposed, what shall it forbid, and what allow? Does any the wildest fanatic, not in the Insane Hospital, believe that a government can be found, which would undertake to regulate so minutely the private habits of the people, that no access shall be had to any thing that can possibly produce intoxication? Or, finally, will any people on earth submit to such inquisition, without evading or breaking the law which enforces it?

We draw near the conclusion of an article which our readers will think already too long. But topics are pressing upon us which it would require a volume to dispose of. We have endeavoured to make it appear, that the *ultra* measures in temperance cannot be justified even on the low ground of expediency. Nor is it *right* to undertake to place fermented liquors under the same condemnation with ardent spirits, declaring them equally dangerous and equally instrumental to human sin and woe. It is not right, in the first place, because it is not true; and no end, however good, can justify the assumption of a false principle to attain it. We have no confidence in any reformation which can be effected by aught

besides the simple truth. That truth has been stated and explained in its bearing on this subject. The laws of temperance, in relation to man's temporal and spiritual well-being, have been unfolded. That it is right to insist on total abstinence from distilled spirits, as the cause of unutterable sin and wretchedness and public calamity, has been distinctly proved. That the same assertions are true with regard to fermented liquors has been, we think, disproved.

Again, it is not right to enter into a combination to deprive our fellow men of a number of articles which, though liable to be made instruments of sinful excess, have an innocent and healthful use. We say that it is false philosophy, false religion; it is not only inexpedient but wrong to enter into a combination for such a purpose. They tell us that "they do not mean to deprive us of these articles without our consent: it is one thing to prohibit an indulgence, and quite another thing to persuade us to abandon it." We do not admit the distinction. It merges the individual in the mass; it sacrifices the rights of the minority, whose assent is to be extorted or compelled. We have no moral right to do that indirectly which it is wrong to do directly. We have no right to make an indulgence impossible or disgraceful by public combination, which it would be wrong to prohibit by law. That a determination actually exists to throw such discredit upon the use of all fermented liquors as to compel every man who values his reputation to abandon them, and even denounce them, though not convinced of their pernicious qualities, appears from the tone of discussion on this subject. Take, as a specimen, the following extract from the review of a "Sermon by Dr. Sprague of Albany."

"It is the province of the temperance reformation, if it cannot directly prevent the use of inebriating liquors, to bring their employment into merited disrepute, to mingle mortification with the mischievous draught, ... to satisfy the female sipper of Champagne, that woman, who was last at the cross and first at the tomb, should be found in her appropriate station here," &c.

Now, if this was said about the *inordinate* use of wine we should have nothing to object; but the whole context shows that it was the *use*, not the immoderate use of the article, that the writer designed to render so infamous as to mingle "mortification with the draught." We utterly disapprove of the

purpose avowed. We deny the right of any body of men to combine and array an immense moral force against the moderate and suitable use of an article which no law of God or of man's organization forbids. We protest against a mode of writing and speech, which artfully confounds the use of fermented liquors with the abuse of them; and so aims to mingle shame and bitterness with the enjoyment of an article which is used in all good conscience by many, not freely as a common beverage, but sparingly and occasionally as a harmless luxury, or a salutary cordial.

We consider it wrong, finally, to enter into a combination to make the use of wine discreditable and offensive, because its use is connected with some of our holiest associations. It is drank at the commemoration of our Saviour's death, as a symbol of his "blood which was shed for many for the remission of sins." We should be shocked at the idea of using at the sacred festival a beverage which we had been taught to regard as as an abomination, and a chief instrument of sin. We do not therefore wonder at those who have this feeling. It is the natural result of the current reasonings against wine to minds which are convinced by them. No consistent man, we think, can fail to be disturbed at the table of the Lord by the presence of an article which he looks upon with horror and aversion elsewhere. The question as to the propriety of using fermented wine at the communion could not well have been avoided; for it naturally followed from the position taken by a part of the temperance reformers. We deeply lament, that it has risen up to disturb the peace of the Christian community. We are grieved that the public mind has been led in such a direction as to make the discussion inevitable. It is even now painfully agitating many a pious mind, and menacing discord and dismemberment to the churches. While we are writing these remarks, we hear of a church in our neighbourhood rent asunder by this agitating controversy, — a portion of its members driven out to seek another place of worship, apart from the brethren with whom they had long communed harmoniously at the table of their Lord. We tremble at the thought of the incalculable evils which may result from this unhappy question. A late writer seriously recommends to settle it summarily, by giving up the communion altogether!

The main argument of those who oppose the use of wine at this ordinance is thus briefly stated by the reviewer of Dr. Sprague's "Sermon":

"Alcohol, in the present condition of public sentiment, is offensive at the Lord's table, and therefore the employment of *fermented wine* at this holy festival is productive of *painful associations*, by which *our communion is embarrassed and embittered.*"

Now we are entitled to ask, Who are responsible for this "condition of public sentiment," which has so connected "painful associations" with the celebration of a festival which Christ instituted? Who have done the deed? Whose writings and speeches have raised and inflamed the prejudices which "embarrass and embitter" the communion? We have not done it; for we have disapproved, from the beginning, the mode of proceeding which has led to this deplorable issue. We beg our fellow Christians to reconsider this matter carefully before they go any farther in agitating the bitter waters of strife, and disturbing tender consciences by needless scruples and distinctions. We shall not attempt to follow the learned discussion of Professor Stuart, nor any others, on the nature of the "fruit of the vine," and the distinction to be taken between wine fermented and wine unfermented. We have no heart to do it; we will not be responsible for keeping the subject a moment longer than is necessary before the minds of our readers. It is needless now to attempt an answer to arguments of this kind; for if our reasonings on the use of wine generally have had any weight, all objections to its use at the communion are of course removed.

In confirmation of our views, we present our readers with a short extract from the "Address" before referred to, which seems to be quite conclusive.

"Total abstinence from wine and other fermented liquors is recommended on the authority of the Bible; and it has been alleged in argument, that the wine which was used in the time of the Saviour, and recommended and drank by him, was not what we understand by the word, but the juice of the grape which had not undergone fermentation. This argument is met by the context in every case in which abstinence from wine is alluded to. The rule of moderation is everywhere enforced, and, from the practice of the times, such a rule was highly pertinent. Men did then drink fermented wine. Wine was then a fermented liquor; it could and did produce intoxication with many of its evils, and, on this account, its use was restricted within the limits of positive modera-

tion. Especially does the rule appear where the habits of the officers of the then church are alluded to. Such men were to be temperate and sober men, as well as the friends of all the virtues. The rule of temperance, then, it has been argued, was the rule recognsied in the highest, most authoritative code of morals which has been delivered to man." — p. 24.

We are however met here by the ever ready argument of "expediency." It is said by high authority, that it is "dangerous for persons to taste even a drop of *consecrated alcohol*," a term by which this element is stigmatised. A story is related of a reformed inebriate, whose cravings for strong drink returned upon him at the communion-table with an unconquerable fury, which drove him to destruction. Such an event may happen perhaps once in a century. Yet we think it could not happen to any one who was at all capable of withstanding the common temptations to which all men must be exposed. This man had probably passed through the reclaimable stage of sin, and his passions, not subdued but pent up, were struggling to break loose on the first occasion that offered. His moral force was gone. The wine of the communion was the occasion, not the cause, of his fall. Would it not be well that such a person should be advised to abstain from this element of the celebration, rather than the whole church should be distressed, and the ordinance endangered, by a controversy of this kind?

The view which plain sense suggests is this. It is evident from the history of our Saviour, that he drank wine, occasionally at least, probably the common wine of the country; and such he directed his disciples to drink "in remembrance of him." It might be new or old, it matters not which to us; we cannot think it material or possible to settle the question. If old, then we suppose it was fermented, and we remind our brethren that he once declared without comment or censure, "The old is better." We think the "better" was the more likely to be in common use, or it would scarcely have "made glad the heart." We also remind them, since they appeal to the Old and New Testaments for argument, that these sacred writings, much as they insist upon temperance, nowhere intimate that total abstinence from fermented wine, or any other wine, is to be urged as a general duty. Once more, we remind them of what is written in the seventh chapter of Luke. If they will carefully read it, and do not find in it evidence that

the Saviour did sometimes drink *fermented* wine, we shall regret the circumstance, but have nothing more to say to such persons in the way of argument. It is admitted on all hands, that there were men among the Jews called wine-bibbers, and that they obtained this appellation by drinking too freely of fermented wine. A man who was known to abstain entirely from this would not be called a wine-bibber even by his enemy. Observe now how Jesus contrasts his own habits with those of the stern, ascetic prophet of the wilderness. "John the Baptist came neither eating bread nor drinking wine, and ye say, He hath a devil. The son of man is come eating and drinking, and ye say, Behold a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber." Eating what? That which John did *not* eat, — bread. Drinking what? That which John did *not* drink, — wine! And it must have been *fermented* wine, for had he totally abstained from this, even the malice of his enemies could not accuse him of being a wine-bibber. These enemies were violent men, who cared not for the truth of their charge; they knew that it was false, as understood in an injurious sense. But they were not absurd enough to bring it against one whose habits of total abstinence made it impossible that it should be true! We have heard it asserted, and seen it printed, that "Jesus was a Nazarene, and therefore drank no wine or strong drink;" but we beg leave to suggest that there is some distinction to be made between one who belonged to the city of Nazareth and one who was under a Nazarene vow! The truth is, he was no "wine-bibber," in the sense they intended. He was pure and perfect, but no ascetic as John was. He was much in society, and did not reject or frown upon its innocent indulgences. He lived a temperate, spiritual, and earnest life. There was a savour of holiness and heaven in his conversation. Good men sought him and loved his society. Wherever he was invited he went, and his presence blessed the entertainment, and made it a feast of wisdom and a nourishing of the soul with the bread and water of life.

C. S.

Art. V. — *Sermon sur Pseaume* cxxvi. 3, *prononcé le jour de Jubilé, dimanche* 23 *Aout,* 1835, *dans la Cathédrale de Saint-Pierre, à midi ;* par M. le Pasteur et Professeur Chenevière. 8vo. pp. 32. Genève.

A Sermon on Psalm cxxvi. 3, preached on the Day of the Jubilee, Sunday, August 23d, 1835, at noon, in St. Peter's Cathedral ; by M. Chenevière, Pastor and Professor.

The commemoration, at Geneva, in August last, of the completion of the third century from the commencement of the Reformation in that city, lasted three days. It was a time of Jubilee to the whole people. In their houses, in their streets, and in their churches, the most animating testimonies were given of their interest in the joyful celebration. The children were made participators in the scene, and took their full share in its hilarities and solemnities, like the children of the Jews at the great festival, that they might learn to adore the God of their fathers, and repeat the story of his goodness to their children after them. Strangers, who had flocked thither from every quarter of Christendom, were received with welcome hospitality, and added to the brilliancy and impressiveness of the occasion. It is true, that there were some bodies of the great Protestant church who refused to join in the holy festival, because the theology of Geneva has changed from what it was in the sixteenth century. They could not sympathize in the gratitude and thanksgiving of brethren who could not stand still for three hundred years. Geneva is as great a heretic in the view of Protestant Europe as she then was in the view of *Catholic* Europe ; and it were as reasonable to expect the countenance of Rome to the apostasy of Calvin, as the favor of Calvinists to the apostasy of his adopted city. Therefore the glorious occasion was marred by the narrowness of those that would not accept the invitation to unite in it, and by the mean bigotry of one who accepted it, only that he might publicly interrupt the festival by his ill-timed denunciations. But notwithstanding this, the voice of congratulation prevailed, and anthems of praise filled the churches and cathedral, and Heaven, we doubt not, smiled on the offering of a simple and grateful people ; a people that have known the light and been willing to walk in it.

The discourse of M. Chenevière is the more interesting to us in this country, because we have here been accustomed to similar celebrations, and easily compare it with our own native orations on such occasions. Our minds readily revert to the centennaries at Plymouth, Boston, Salem, and other important places, at which we have been used to see our distinguished men, excited by the recollections of the past and the images of the fathers, stand up to commemorate the goodness of God, and utter instruction for the people. We know how exhilarating such days are, and how much they do for the mind and heart of the people; and we probably are able on that account to enter with peculiar relish into the feelings of that little Swiss people, on their recent day of gratulation. We see their quiet crowds, and understand the emotion which swells their bosoms, and sympathize in all the ardor with which they sit in their high place of worship, and listen to the animating words of their appointed preacher. In the present instance, the historical notices and the devout reflections, which belong to the occasion, are such as fully to satisfy and excite the mind; though one would be better pleased to miss the extreme formality which marks the distribution of the discourse; which, however consonant to the custom of the French pulpit, is yet confessedly arbitrary and artificial, and greatly wanting in that freedom which should prevail on a day of enthusiasm. The exordium, and the several divisions of the subject, and the peroration are distinctly marked, and printed apart like so many separate chapters, reminding us of Mrs. Barbauld's account of the use of this formality of method in actual delivery. "At proper periods of the discourse," she says in one of her lively letters from Geneva, "the minister stops short, and turns his back upon you, in order to blow his nose, which is a signal for all the congregation to do the same; and a glorious concert it is, for the weather is already severe, and people have got colds. I am told too, that he takes this time to refresh his memory by peeping at his sermon which lies behind him in the pulpit!" The time is hardly long enough for the latter purpose, but those who have visited Geneva can testify that it answers the former as well as if it were made purposely with that view.

In the discourse before us, the exordium is of considerable length, containing a brief reference to the most remarkable interpositions of God in the history of the human race, the last,

and not the least important of which, is the Reformation in the sixteenth century. The general benefits of this Reformation form the subject of the first division, and are ranged under four heads: — First, the restoration of Faith to its true basis, taking it away from tradition, popes, and councils, and placing it once more upon the Bible, and the Bible alone. Second, diminishing the worth of mere ceremonies, and increasing that of a moral life; no longer causing men to rest on such a penance, such a prayer, fast, or confession, but insisting on obedience to the divine law; and hence the preacher remarks, that, on making a comparison of the state of morals in different communities, for example, in Prussia and Spain, in the Protestant Swiss cantons and Italy, there is universally acknowledged to be a decided advantage of the Protestant over the Catholic. No one can have visited those countries without noticing the fact. Third, the Reformation has changed the relation of the priesthood to the people, and of the Church to the State. It has set society free from a yoke which all history shows to have been most galling and oppressive, and has made the ministers of Christ what they were intended to be, the counsellors and friends, the teachers and comforters, of their fellow men. Fourth, it has established the principles of free inquiry and liberty of conscience, which did not exist before; it has proved itself the great epoch of the emancipation of thought; has thus wrought great things for the advancement of society, and essentially meliorated the condition of the Catholic church itself.

In the second division of the discourse, the preacher speaks of "the particular advantages of the Reformation to his own country," and in the course of it refers to the men who were the principal agents in effecting it.

"In this little city, whose cruel sufferings I have described, God, who designed for the accomplishment of his own plans to render it a centre of life and light, assembles his workmen and puts them to the work. There, are formed and brought together in groups those great characters which commonly appear at distant intervals. There is Farel, that intrepid man, whose voice, three centuries ago, resounded within these very walls, whose sermons were accounted divine, and who, after his superhuman efforts here, went out like another apostle to carry to our neighbours and allies the treasure of the gospel. There is Froment, who, by his persevering labors and his personal courage, hastens on the tardy hour of deliverance. There is Viret, less powerful, but not less devoted, whose elo-

quence was persuasion. There is "that Frenchman," as our records call him on the first occasion of speaking of him; when he began his work within our walls, they did not know that name whose celebrity was to fill the city, the country, the earth; — there is Calvin, that powerful man, whose Institutions, the College and the Academy, have continued for three centuries, and deserve to be perpetual; Calvin, whose iron arm was needful to sustain the Reformation in its hour of peril; that man of admirable policy, who enlightened the earth like a burning sun; that sun of the church which, like that of nature, has its spots and its worshippers. These vigorous wrestlers press into the ring, and rush forward devotedly to the work. Men of giant power, men of faith, distinguished servants of God, blessed be your memory!"

The third division of the discourse is occupied with a view of "the causes of success." These he finds, in general terms, in the corrupted and profligate condition of the Romish church, which had prepared men's minds to rise against it, and in the heroic and Christian virtue of the men who led the Reform, trusting in the help of Heaven and evidently blessed by a peculiar providence.

"The recoil of these shocks was felt here in our own country; but God preserved our ark amidst the tumult of the waves, and our fathers exhibited virtues which hastened the victory. And if they baffled all the calculations of human foresight, if they conquered in spite of their weakness, it was because those men of the sixteenth century were men of profound convictions, — because their devotion to their country and their faith upheld their courage and constancy, — because their masculine virtues were fed at the burning altar of a living piety. "God fights for us," was their reply to all seductions and threats. And when, six months after the Reformation, they repelled the assaults that were made on the city from four different quarters, they made no boast of their valor or their wisdom; they saw but the hand of their heavenly deliverer; they repeated the exclamation of their great souls, "God repulsed them, to God be all the praise." His hand they acknowledged everywhere, his blessing they invoked in the hour of battle, in Him they trusted in the day of misfortune, Him, always Him, they exalted amid the transports of victory. And thus, throughout that unequal struggle, they displayed a self-denial, a firmness, a spirit of sacrifice, which could flow from no source but the liveliness of their faith." — pp. 21, 22.

Here he cites several instances, and then proceeds:

"And you, our ancestors! receive from your children the solemn homage of their admiration and love. We see in your

faith, your devotion, your trust in God, the whole secret of your success. ..... And that secret they have not carried away with them, nor is it hidden in their graves; they have bequeathed it to us as our most precious heritage; they have left to us a free country, a united and powerful church, with the charge to transmit them to our children. God helping us, we will do it! We will not suffer the fruits of so many prayers and so many virtues to perish in our hands. Our country and the church shall always hold the first place in our regard, as they did in that of our fathers. At the sound of the tocsin they stretched out their suppliant hands, and cast themselves on the protection of those brave men, — men who had witnessed their birth, their sufferings, their perils, and their triumph, and were attached to their cause with zealous and devoted love. The country and the church appeal to us, in our turn; with what unanimity should we follow in their glorious footsteps!"

The peroration consists of an appeal to the people of Geneva to be faithful to the pledges of their distinguished history and their favored lot, and closes with the following striking paragraph.

"Finally, my brethren, let me present to you, in closing, one scene of our history.

"It was on the twenty-first of May, 1536. They had hardly escaped destruction at the cost of the severest sacrifices. The genius of revolution and vengeance was hovering over the city and the country. The future was gloomy and threatening, the enemy exasperated and powerful, the sky loaded with tempests. There were new attacks to be sustained, new plots to be feared, large forces to be repulsed. Our fathers were poor and few. The magistrates assembled them in general council within this very cathedral. They attempted no concealment of the danger; with the rude frankness of the times, they set it forth as it was, near and terrible. There, those same citizens, those reformers, who might have recounted their fatigues, complained of their losses, showed their wounds, and shrunk back affrighted at the prospect which now threatened them; those firm and devoted Christians only clung to each other the more closely; in the name of God, who had so often saved them, they raised their hands with one accord, and swore to live by the holy law of the Gospel, to cast off for ever all that was Papal, and to live in righteousness and union. This oath they kept. And now, at this anniversary, on the same spot, this day, this moment, at the footstool of the same God, and in his name, I ask you to lift your hands like our fathers. Let us engage, let us swear, that we will live in union and in obedience to the laws of the Reformation and the Gospel.

"God be our witness! and we — let us be faithful! Amen!"

It has been our object in this article, simply to give an account of the discourse delivered by a distinguished man on an occasion of peculiar interest. We hope to have another opportunity of recurring to the occasion itself, and to some of the circumstances of that remarkable event, which it was designed to commemorate. H. W., JR.

ART VI. — 1. *Letters from Spain.* By Don LEUCADIO DOBLADO. London. 1822. 8vo. pp. 483.

2. *Practical and Internal Evidence against Catholicism, with Occasional Strictures on Mr. Butler's "Book of the Roman Catholic Church": in Six Letters, addressed to the impartial among the Roman Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland.* By the Rev. JOSEPH BLANCO WHITE, M. A., B. D. in the University of Seville; Licentiate of Divinity in the University of Osuna; formerly Chaplain Magistral (Preacher) to the King of Spain, in the Royal Chapel at Seville; Fellow, and once Rector, of the College of St. Mary *a Jesu* of the same Town; Synodal Examiner of the Diocess of Cadiz; Member of the Royal Academy of Belles-Lettres, of Seville, &c. &c.; now a Clergyman of the Church of England; Author of "Doblado's Letters from Spain." First American Edition. Georgetown, D. C. 1826. 12mo. pp. 315.

3. *The Poor Man's Preservative against Popery: addressed to the Lower Classes of Great Britain and Ireland.* By the Rev. JOSEPH BLANCO WHITE, formerly Chaplain to the King of Spain, &c. The fourth Edition, revised by the Author. London. 1827. 12mo. pp. 108.

4. *Second Travels of an Irish Gentleman in Search of a Religion. With Notes and Illustrations,* NOT by the EDITOR OF "CAPTAIN ROCK'S MEMOIRS." In two Volumes. Dublin: 1833. 16mo. pp. 249 and 245.

5. *Observations on Heresy and Orthodoxy.* By the Rev. JOSEPH BLANCO WHITE. London: 1835. 8vo. pp. 120.

THOUGH the first of the abovementioned works was published under an assumed name, and the fourth anonymously, they are all from the same pen. Aside from the interest inspired by the nature of the subjects, and by the ability, expe-

rience, and information, which the author has brought in every instance to the discussion, few writers have been able to awaken in us any thing like the same degree of personal regard, grounded on a sense of his worth, and a knowledge of his trials. As his life and writings are but little known in this country, we propose to give some account of them here; our principal object being, however, to collect together the scattered notices which he has given, in his various publications, of the remarkable changes through which his own mind and character have passed.

Joseph Blanco White, though a native of Andalusia, in Spain, is of Irish descent. His grandfather was induced, by his predilections and sufferings as a Roman Catholic, to emigrate from the county of Waterford, in Ireland, and to establish himself at Seville, where he carried on extensive business as a merchant, and raised himself and his family to the rank of Hidalgos, by patent obtained early in the reign of Ferdinand VI. The eldest son of this gentleman was sent, when a child, to the country of his ancestors for education, that he might not become wholly estranged from it; and thus it was, as we are told, that the two most powerful and genuine elements of a religionist were wrought into his mental constitution, — the unhesitating faith of persecuting Spain, and the impassioned belief of persecuted Ireland. On his return, he married a Spanish lady of great purity and sensibility of character, and more strength and cultivation of mind than are common among her countrywomen to this day; but, in religious matters, a devotee and a slave. Such were the parents of the subject of these sketches; than whom, it would indeed be difficult to find two more favorable examples for observing the effects of the Catholic religion, or winning over and binding a child, naturally affectionate and reverential, to the faith in which he was most assiduously and conscientiously trained. In his "Letters from Spain" our author says:

"With hardly any thing to spare, I do not recollect a time when our house was not a source of relief and consolation to some families of such as, by a characteristic and feeling appellation, are called among us the *blushing poor.** In all seasons, for thirty years of his life, my father allowed himself no other relaxation, after the fatiguing business of his counting-house, than a visit to the General Hospital of this town, — a horrible scene of misery, where four or five hundred beggars are, at a time, allowed to lay

* *Pobres vergonzantes.*

themselves down and die, when worn out by want and disease. Stripping himself of his coat, and having put on a coarse dress for the sake of cleanliness, in which he was scrupulous to a fault, he was employed, till late at night, in making the beds of the poor, taking the helpless in his arms, and stooping to such services as even the menials in attendance were often loth to perform. All this he did of his own free will, without the least connexion, public or private, with the establishment. Twice he was at death's door from the contagious influence of the atmosphere in which he exerted his charity. But no danger would appal him when engaged in administering relief to the needy. Foreigners, cast by misfortune into that gulf of wretchedness, were the peculiar objects of his kindness." — *Letters from Spain*, pp. 70, 71.

All this, though deeply tinged with asceticism, was of a nature favorably to impress the child's mind; but not so, much that he witnessed abroad. "I well remember," he says, "the last that was burnt for being a heretic, in my own town. It was a poor blind woman. I was then about eight years old, and saw the pile of wood, upon barrels of pitch and tar, where she was reduced to ashes." Notwithstanding his religious prejudices, he must have turned away with instinctive horror from such a scene, if we may form an opinion of what his dispositions were at this time by another anecdote incidentally told. After speaking of the deep taint, which the slightest mixture of African, Indian, Moorish, or Jewish blood is supposed in Spain to fix, not only in the individual, but in his descendants to the most distant generation, he goes on: "Not a child in this populous city is ignorant that a family, who, beyond the memory of man, have kept a confectioner's shop in the central part of the town, had one of its ancestors punished by the Inquisition for a relapse into Judaism. I well recollect how, when a boy, I often passed that way, scarcely venturing to cast a side-glance on a pretty young woman who constantly attended the shop, for fear, as I said to myself, of shaming her."

The first important epoch in the religious life of a Catholic, is his first confession, which generally takes place on his attaining the age of seven, that being the period at which, according to Catholic divines, moral responsibility begins. Our Author's remarks on this subject are too important to be passed over.*

* That the paper in the "Letters from Spain," entitled "A Few

"The effects of confession upon young minds are, generally, unfavorable to their future peace and virtue. It was to that practice I owed the first taste of remorse, while yet my soul was in a state of infant purity. My fancy had been strongly impressed with the awful conditions of the penitential law, and the word *sacrilege* had made me shudder on being told that the act of concealing any thought or action, the rightfulness of which I suspected, would make me guilty of that worst of crimes, and greatly increase my danger of everlasting torments. My parents had, in this case, done no more than their duty according to the rules of their church. But, though they had succeeded in rousing my fear of hell, this was, on the other hand, too feeble to overcome the childish bashfulness, which made the disclosure of a harmless trifle an effort above my strength.

"The appointed day came at last, when I was to wait on the confessor. Now wavering, now determined not to be guilty of sacrilege, I knelt before the priest, leaving, however, in my list of sins, the last place to the hideous offence — I believe it was a petty larceny committed on a young bird. But, when I came to the dreadful point, shame and confusion fell upon me, and the accusation stuck in my throat. The imaginary guilt of this silence haunted my mind for four years, gathering horrors at every successive confession, and rising into an appalling spectre, when, at the age of twelve, I was taken to receive the sacrament. In this miserable state I continued till, with the advance of reason, I plucked, at fourteen, courage enough to unburthen my conscience by a general confession of the past. And let it not be supposed that mine is a singular case, arising either from morbid feeling or the nature of my early education. Few, indeed, among the many penitents I have examined, have escaped the evils of a similar state; for, what a silly bashfulness does in children, is often, in after-life, the immediate effect of that shame by which fallen frailty clings still to wounded virtue." — *Ibid.* pp. 76, 77.

The fortune of the family having been greatly reduced in consequence of the mismanagement of a commercial agent, it became necessary that the boy's attention should be early turned to some business or profession, as a means of support.

Facts connected with the Formation of the Intellectual and Moral Character of a Spanish Clergyman," was intended to give the history of the author's own mind, is clear from the following statement in the preface. "These letters are in fact the faithful memoirs of a real Spanish clergyman." He also refers, in the first letter of his "Evidence against Catholicism," to the account given in this paper of the parents of the Spanish clergyman, as being a true account of his own parents.

Under these circumstances, it was determined to fit him, the eldest of four children, for his father's counting-house, with a view to his succeeding to the establishment when his father should retire; but the meagre training deemed sufficient for this purpose gives but a melancholy picture of the state of education in Spain, even among the better classes.

"A private teacher was accordingly procured, who read with me in the evening, after I had spent the best part of the day in making copies of the extensive correspondence of the house. I was now about ten years old, and though, from a child, excessively fond of reading, my acquaintance with books did not extend beyond the history of the Old Testament, a collection of the Lives of the Saints mentioned in the Catholic Almanac, out of which I chose the Martyrs, for modern Saints were never to my taste, — a little work that gave an amusing miracle of the Virgin Mary for every day of the year, — and, prized above all, a Spanish translation of Fenelon's Telemachus, which I perused till I had nearly learned it by heart. I heard, therefore, with uncommon pleasure that, in acquiring a knowledge of Latin, I should have to read stories not unlike that of my favorite, the Prince of Ithaca. Little time, however, was allowed me for study, lest, from my love of learning, I should conceive a dislike to mercantile pursuits. But my mind had taken a decided bent. I hated the counting-house, and loved my books. Learning and the church were, to me, inseparable ideas; and I soon declared to my mother that I would be nothing but a clergyman." — *Ibid.* pp. 80, 81.

The superstition of his parents, seconded, as it probably was in the instance in question, by family pride, and the influence of their spiritual advisers, would have accounted it a sort of sacrilege to oppose this self-consecration of their child. He was, therefore, sent first to the College of Dominicans, and afterwards to the University of Seville, to prepare himself for orders; but the regular routine of studies pursued at these places aimed at nothing higher than giving an imperfect knowledge of logic, natural philosophy, and school divinity. Even at that time, however, there appears to have existed, in most of the Spanish Universities, a philosophical party, a knot of bolder spirits, who, unawed by the spies and dungeons of the Inquisition, were not afraid to wander a little from the beaten paths. Our author's innate love of truth, and impatience of restraint soon drew him within the influences of a circle of this description; and it was through the stealthy privileges thus enjoyed, that he made his first acquaintance with

the literature of his own country, as well as with that of Italy and France. One thing led to another.

"Hitherto," he says, "I had never had courage enough to take a forbidden book in my hands. The excommunication impending over me by the words *ipso facto* was indeed too terrific an object for my inexperienced mind. Delighted with the taste for poetry and eloquence which I had acquired, I had never brooded over any religious doubts, — or rather, sincerely adhering to the Roman Catholic law, which makes the examination of such doubts as great a crime as the denial of the article of belief they affect, I had always shrunk with terror from every heterodox suggestion. But my now intimate friend and guide had made canon law his profession. Ecclesiastical history, in which he was deeply versed, had, without weakening his Catholic principles, made him a pupil of that school of canonists who, both in Germany and Italy, having exposed the forgeries by means of which papal power had made itself paramount to every human authority, were but too visibly disposed to a separation from Rome. My friend denied the existence of any power in the church to inflict excommunication, without a declaratory sentence in consequence of the trial of the offender. Upon the strength of this doctrine, he made me read the 'Discourses on Ecclesiastical History,' by the Abbé Fleury, — a work teeming with invective against monks and friars, doubts on modern miracles, and strictures on the virtues of modern saints. Eve's heart, I confess, when

> ——— 'her rash hand in evil hour
> Forth reaching to the fruit, she plucked, she ate,'

could not have beaten more convulsively than mine, as I opened the forbidden book. Vague fears and doubts haunted my conscience for many days. But my friend, besides being a sound Catholic, was a devout man. He had lately taken priest's orders, and was now not only my literary, but my spiritual director. His abilities and his affection to me had obtained a most perfect command over my mind, and it was not long before I could match him in mental boldness, on points unconnected with articles of faith.

"This was, indeed, the happiest period of my life. The greatest part of my time, with the exception of that required for my daily attendance at the dull lectures of the divinity professors, was devoted to the French critics, André, Le Bossu, Batteux, Rollin, La Harpe, and many others of less note. The habit of analyzing language and ideas, which I acquired in the perusal of such works, soon led me to some of the French metaphysicians, especially Condillac." — *Ibid.* pp. 118 – 120.

But the light that liberalized his mind had begun already to

unsettle it. Often he recoiled at the approach of the day when, at the canonical age of twenty-five, he was to bind himself to his profession by the irrevocable vow. It came, however; and his own impressive account of what took place on the occasion will show, that the imposing ritual of his church had not lost, as yet, any considerable degree of its power over his imagination.

"If mental excitement, attended with the most thrilling and sublime sensations, though arising from deception, could be indulged without injury to our noblest faculties, — if life could be made a long dream without the painful startings produced by the din and collision of the world, — if the opium of delusion could be largely administered without a complete enervation of our rational energies, — the lot of a man of feeling, brought up in the undisturbed belief of the Catholic doctrines, and raised to be a dispenser of its mysteries, would be enviable above all others. No abstract persuasions, if I am to trust my experience, can either soothe our fears or feed our hopes, independently of the imagination; and I am strongly inclined to assert that no genuine persuasion exists upon unearthly subjects, without the coöperation of the imaginative faculty. Hence the powerful effects of the splendid and striking system of worship adopted by the Roman church. A foreigner may be inclined to laugh at the strange ceremonies performed in a Spanish cathedral, because these ceremonies are a conventional language, to which he attaches no ideas. But he that, from the cradle, has been accustomed to kiss the hand of every priest, and receive his blessing, — that has associated the name and attributes of the Deity with the consecrated bread, — that has observed the awe with which it is handled, — how none but a priest dare touch it, — what clouds of incense, what brilliancy of gems, surround it when exposed to the view; with what heart-felt anxiety the glare of lights, the sound of music, and the uninterrupted adoration of the priests in waiting, are made to evince the overpowering feeling of a God dwelling among men; such a man alone can conceive the state of a warm-hearted youth, who, for the first time, approaches the altar, not as a mere attendant, but as the sole worker of the greatest of miracles.

"No language can do justice to my own feelings at the ceremony of ordination, the performance of the first mass, and during the interval which elapsed between this fever of enthusiasm and the cold skepticism that soon followed it. For some months previous to the awful ceremony I voluntarily secluded myself from the world, making religious reading and meditation the sole employment of my time. The *Exercises of Saint Ignatius*, which immediately preceded the day of ordination, filled my heart with what

appeared to me a settled distaste for every worldly pleasure. When the consecrating rites had been performed, when my hands had been anointed, the sacred vesture, at first folded on my shoulders, let drop around me by the hands of the bishop, the sublime hymn to the all-creating Spirit uttered in solemn strains, and the power of restoring sinners to innocence conferred upon me; when, at length, raised to the dignity of a 'fellow-worker with God,' the bishop addressed me, in the name of the Saviour: 'Henceforth I call you not servant . . . . . but I have called you friend;' I truly felt as if, freed from the material part of my being, I belonged to a higher rank of existence. I had still a heart, it is true, — a heart ready to burst at the sight of my parents, on their knees, while impressing the first kiss on my newly consecrated hands; but it was dead to the charms of beauty. Among the friendly crowd that surrounded me for the same purpose, were those lips which, a few months before, I would have died to press; yet I could but just mark their superior softness. In vain did I exert myself to check exuberance of feelings at my first mass. My tears bedewed the *corporals* on which, with the eyes of faith, I beheld the disguised lover of mankind whom I had drawn from heaven to my hands. These are dreams, indeed, — the illusions of an over-heated fancy; but dreams they are which some of the noblest minds have dreamt through life without waking, — dreams which, while passing vividly before the mental eye, must entirely wrap up the soul of every one who is neither *more* nor *less* than a man." — *Ibid.* pp. 122 – 125.

For a time, nothing could exceed the fidelity with which he applied himself to the labors and studies proper to the sacred office; in proof of which, it is only necessary to observe, that a year had scarcely elapsed after his elevation to the priesthood, before he obtained, by competition with other candidates in a public examination, the place of *Magistral*, or Preacher, in the chapter of King's Chaplains, at Seville. Light clouds of doubt began now to pass over his mind, which the warmth of his devotion alone was able to dissipate: but they returned again and again, and the darkness thickened around him. The crisis we will give in his own words.

"One morning, as I was wrapt up in my usual thoughts, on the banks of the Guadalquivir, a gentleman who had lately been named by the government to an important place in our provincial judicature, joined me in the course of my ramble. We had been acquainted but a short time, and he, though forced into caution by an early danger from the Inquisition, was still friendly and communicative. His talents of forensic eloquence, and the sprightliness

and elegance of his conversation, had induced a conviction on my mind, that he belonged to the philosophical party of the university where he had been educated. Urged by an irresistible impulse, I ventured with him upon neutral ground, — monks, ecclesiastical encroachments, extravagant devotion, — till the stream of thought I had thus allowed to glide over the feeble mound of my fears, swelling every moment, broke forth as a torrent from its long and violent confinement. I was listened to with encouraging kindness, and there was not a doubt in my heart which I did not disclose. Doubts they had indeed appeared to me till that moment; but utterance transformed them, at once, into demonstrations. It would be impossible to describe the fear and trepidation that seized me the moment I parted from my good-natured confidant. The prisons of the Inquisition seemed ready to close their studded gates upon me; and the very hell I had just denied, appeared yawning before my eyes. Yet, a few days elapsed, and no evil had overtaken me. I performed mass with a heart in open rebellion to the Church that enjoined it: but I had now settled with myself to offer it up to my Creator, as I imagined that the enlightened Greeks and Romans must have done their sacrifices. I was, like them, forced to express my thankfulness in an absurd language." — *Ibid.* pp. 131 – 133.

In opposition to those who maintain, "that immorality and levity are *always* the source of unbelief," he says in his "Evidence against Catholicism": "As to myself, I declare most solemnly, that my rejection of Christianity took place at a period when my conscience could not reproach me with any open breach of duty but those committed several years before; that, during the transition from religious belief to incredulity, the horror of sins against the faith, deeply implanted by education in my soul, haunted me night and day; and that I exerted all the powers of my mind to counteract the involuntary doubts which were daily acquiring an irresistible strength." His lapse into a state bordering on atheism, is not difficult to be accounted for on other principles. The fervors of his devotion, while they lasted, had no better foundation than an artificial and temporary excitement of the feelings and imagination; and his belief, if belief it could be called, never rested on degrees of evidence, or on rational conviction of any kind, but on the single point of arbitrary authority, it being assumed by him, in common with most Catholics, that the only alternative was between revelation as explained by the church of Rome, and no revelation. It was, Catholic or Deist; Christ with the Pope, or no Christ. In this state of mind, every thing of course depended

on his continuing to believe in the pretended infallibility of the church; and when, at last, his confidence in that was shaken, it was but one step to universal skepticism, — a step he was the more likely to take, all religion being associated, now that his eyes were opened, with the insult and wrong which he felt had been done to himself and others, under its abused name. But to go on with his autobiography.

"When I had in my own mind thrown off all allegiance to the Christian religion, though I tried to enjoy myself, and indulge my desires, I could find neither happiness nor comfort. My mind was naturally averse to deceit, and I could not brook the necessity of acting publicly as the minister of a religion which I believed to be false. But what could I do? As for wealth and honors, heaven knows they did not weigh a straw against my love of manly openness and liberty. I once, indeed, went so far as to write to a friend who lived at Cadiz, and whom, after many years' absence, I have lately seen in London, to procure me a passage to North America, whither I wished to escape, trusting to my own labor for subsistence. But when I looked round and saw my dear father and mother on the decline of life: when I considered that my flight would bring their grey hairs with sorrow to the grave, tears would gush into my eyes, and the courage which I owed to anger melted at once into love for the authors of my being. Ten years of my life did I pass in this hot and cold fever, this ague of the heart, without a hope, without a drop of that cordial which cheers the very soul of those who sacrifice their desires to their duty, under the blessed influence of religion." — *Poor Man's Preservative*, pp. 9, 10.

In 1810, Spain being invaded by a French army which was sweeping all before it, an occasion for quitting his native land presented itself, and was eagerly embraced by our author; and this, too, with the entire concurrence of his parents, whose regrets at his departure were overborne by anxiety for his personal safety. On landing in England, the country which he chose for an asylum, and has since adopted as his own, he happily fell into a circle of friends and acquaintances, who united to sincere and heart-felt piety, great mildness and liberality of temper; and in their society, and under the protection of British liberty, the soreness and irritation of his mind on the subject of religion were gradually allayed, and that yearning for spiritual support and satisfaction, which can never be entirely banished from a heart of any sensibility, began to return.

"An accident," says he, "(if any thing which leads to results so

important, can be so called,) made me, in an idle moment, look into Paley's 'Natural Theology,' which lay upon a table. I was struck by the author's peculiar manner and style; I borrowed the book, and read it with great interest. Feelings of piety towards the great Author of nature began to thaw the unnatural frost which misery, inflicted in his name, had produced in a heart not formed to be ungrateful. It was in this state of mind that, being desirous of seeing every thing worthy of observation in England, I went one Sunday to St. James's church. A foreigner, ignorant of the language, would have brought away nothing but an unpleasant recollection of the length of the service; but I had learnt English in my childhood, and could understand it, at this time, without difficulty. The prayers, though containing what I did not believe, appeared to me solemn and affecting. I had not for many years entered a church without feelings of irritation and hostility, arising from the ideas of oppressive tyranny which it called up in my mind; but here was nothing that could check sympathy, or smother the reviving sentiments of natural religion, which Paley had awakened. It happened that, before the sermon, was given Addison's beautiful hymn,

> 'When all thy mercies, O my God,
> My rising soul surveys,
> Transported with the view, I 'm lost
> In wonder, love, and praise.'

At the end of the second verse, my eyes were streaming with tears; and I believe that from that day, I never passed one without some ardent aspirations towards the Author of my life and existence." — *Evidence against Catholicism*, pp. 25, 26.

He was now about thirty-five years of age, a foreigner, and dependent for the most part on his pen for support. Still he found some time daily for pursuing his inquiries into the truth of Christianity, and took care not to trust to a study of the evidences alone, as a means of faith, knowing that moral and spiritual exercises and attainments are also necessary to put the mind in a condition to apprehend the reality of spiritual things. The result was, that at the expiration of little more than a year, having become a believer on rational grounds, he received the sacrament for the first time according to the forms of the English Church, and in about a year and a half afterwards resumed the sacred office by taking orders in that communion. He then retired to Oxford, that he might live privately in that great seat of learning, and devote his time exclusively to the study of the Scriptures; and for more than

three years his investigations do not appear to have wrought any considerable change in his opinions. But now another trial awaited him, of which he thus speaks, during a temporary relapse into Orthodoxy.

"My vehement desire of knowledge not allowing me to neglect any opportunity of reading whatever books on divinity came to my hands, I studied the small work on the Atonement, by Taylor of Norwich. The confirmed habits of my mind were too much in accordance with every thing that promised to remove *mystery* from Christianity, and I adopted Taylor's views without in the least suspecting the consequences. It was not long, however, before I found myself beset with great doubts on the divinity of Christ. My state became now exceedingly painful; for, though greatly wanting religious comfort in the solitude of a sick room, where I was a prey to pain and extreme weakness, I perceived that religious practices had lost their power of soothing me. But no danger or suffering has, in the course of my life, deterred me from the pursuit of truth. Having now suspected it might be found in the Unitarian system, I boldly set out upon the search; but there I did not find it. Whatever industry and attention could do, all was performed with candor and earnestness; but, in length of time, Christianity, in the light of Unitarianism, appeared to me a mighty work to little purpose: and I lost all hope of quieting my mind. With doubts unsatisfied wherever I turned, I found myself rapidly sliding into the gulf of skepticism; but it pleased God to prevent my complete relapse. I knew too well the map of infidelity to be deluded a second time by the hope of finding a resting-place to the sole of my foot, throughout its wide domains. And now I took and kept a determination to give my mind some rest from the studies, which, owing to my peculiar circumstances, had evidently occasioned the moral fever under which I labored." — *Ibid.* pp. 34, 35.

"My mind, in fact, found rest in that kind of conviction which belongs peculiarly to moral subjects, and seems to depend on an intuitive perception of the truth through broken clouds of doubt, which it is not in the power of mortal man completely to dispel. Let no one suppose that I allude to either mysterious or enthusiastic feelings; I speak of conviction arising from examination. But any man, accustomed to observe the workings of the mind, will agree, that conviction, in intricate moral questions, comes finally in the shape of internal feeling, — a *perception* perfectly distinct from syllogistic conviction, but which exerts the strongest power over our moral nature. Such *perception* of the truth is, indeed, the spring of our most important actions, the common bond of social life, the ground of retributive justice, the parent of all human laws. Yet, it is inseparable from more or less doubt; for *doubtless*

conviction is only to be found about objects of sense, or those abstract creations of the mind, pure number and dimension, which employ the ingenuity of mathematicians. That assurance respecting things not seen, which the Scriptures call *Faith*, is a *supernatural* gift, which reasoning can never produce. This difference between the conviction resulting from the examination of the Christian Evidences, and *Faith*, in the Scriptural sense of the word, appears to me of vital importance, and much to be attended to by such as, having renounced the Gospel, are yet disposed to give a candid hearing to its advocates. The power of the Christian Evidences is that of leading any considerate mind, unobstructed by prejudice, to the records of Revelation, and making it ready to derive instruction from that source of supernatural truth; but it is the *Spirit of truth* alone, that can impart the internal conviction of *Faith*." — *Ibid.* pp. 37, 38.

We are glad to have this comment by an ingenious and well-principled man on the means by which he successfully resisted, for some years, the natural tendency of his mind towards Unitarianism, and contrived to retain his place in the ranks of the Orthodox without any sacrifice, as he believed at the time, either of truth or sincerity. It was indeed a very simple and easy expedient, consisting merely in shutting his eyes on the evidence, or, as he chose at the period of which we are now speaking to express it, in giving rest to his mind. — But he perceived, he says, that religious exercises had lost their power of soothing him. That is, when the popular system had lost its hold on his convictions, and Unitarianism had not as yet been so understood and embraced by him, as to be wrought into his heart and life, he felt himself to be without those spiritual supports and alleviations which his nature craved. Practically speaking, his hesitancy to adopt Unitarianism, to the verge of which he had been brought by the study of the Bible, left him without any religion at all for the time being. Unitarianism did not support him, because he was not as yet, in any proper sense of the word, a Unitarian. He still hesitated to become one, against his own convictions of what the Scriptures taught; and why did he hesitate? Because, as he tells us, "Christianity, in the light of Unitarianism, *appeared to me* a mighty work to little purpose." Accordingly, losing all hope of quieting his mind by this resource, *he did not try it.* He shut his eyes on the light which was beginning to dissipate his errors and prejudices, and went back to those errors and prejudices, as far as such a step was practicable. — But how could

he recover his lost confidence in those errors and prejudices? By mystifying the nature and grounds of faith. If in what he alleges respecting the impossibility of attaining absolute certainty on many moral questions, and respecting faith considered as "a supernatural gift, which reasoning can never produce," but which "the Spirit of truth alone" can impart, he only means that the heart as well as the understanding, that the moral as well as the intellectual nature of man, must be in a right state, before he can be in a condition properly to appreciate spiritual truth, or arrive at a living faith in the spiritual world, it is, we suppose, what no well-informed Christian will be inclined to deny. But if it is intended to find in such suggestions an argument for clinging to errors and prejudices which reason and Scripture alike repudiate, and we ourselves have outgrown, it is a striking instance of the sort of sophistry, or rather of vague and confused language, by which good and sensible men, if bent upon it, will allow themselves to be misled. The mental phenomenon here described was by no means peculiar to our author, but has taken place, we suppose, in nine cases out of ten among the nominally Orthodox, who at any period of their lives have given themselves for a time to the serious, dispassionate, and impartial study of the Bible. The evidence, they see, is against their preconceived notions; still they are unwilling to give up these notions for various reasons, and among the rest from distrust of the power of more rational views to nourish and sustain the soul, — a distrust which, however honestly entertained, our author's subsequent experience has demonstrated, as will soon appear, to be utterly unfounded. In short his own conduct, on his first perception of the unsoundness of Orthodoxy, is a striking illustration of a just and sagacious remark made by himself in the very work from which our last extract is taken. "If," says he, "my observation of intellectual phenomena do not deceive me, the mass of those who may be said to think at all, can go no further in a reasoning process, than just to perceive one difficulty against their settled notions, *and to catch some verbal quibble which removes the difficulty from their sight.* The process of examining the usual fallacies of such answers is, to most men, so painful, that any serious attempt to urge them upon it, seldom fails to rouse their anger. *There are, indeed, but few who can take a true second step in reasoning.*"

It will be recollected, that the preceding account which Mr.

White gives of himself at this interesting period, was published during his temporary reconciliation to the Church of England. In the preface to his last work, which has appeared since his entire and hearty adoption and open avowal of Unitarian sentiments, he expresses himself in quite a different strain.

"My doubts of the truth of the established views began with the systematic and devout study of the Scriptures, which I undertook in 1814, when, free from the literary engagements which, in the service of England as well as of my native country, had occupied me during the four preceding years, I removed to Oxford, for the exclusive purpose of devoting myself to theology. In the year 1818, (as it may be distinctly proved by the journals I kept at that time, and which are still in my possession,) I arrived at the Unitarian view of Christianity; but the perfect obscurity in which I was living, and the consideration that I had not then published any thing, except in Spanish, appeared to me a sufficient ground for not making a public avowal of my conviction. Having, till about 1824, continued in that state, and, in spite of difficulties, resulting from the notion of Orthodoxy, faithfully attached to Christianity, a revival of my early mental habits, and of those devotional sentiments which are inseparably connected with the idea of intellectual surrender to some church, induced me again to *acquiesce* in the established doctrines, — not from conviction, not by the discovery of sounder proofs than those which I had found insufficient, but chiefly by the power of that sympathy which tends to assimilation with those we love and respect." — *Heresy and Orthodoxy*, p. vi.

In 1817 he published at Oxford a small volume under the following title: "Preparatory Observations on the Study of Religion. By a Clergyman of the Church of England." We have not seen it. His "Letters from Spain" appeared in 1822; a work replete with interest, and containing more authentic and valuable information respecting the private, domestic, and religious condition of his countrymen than any other in our language. In 1825, while the Catholic question was pending in England, he sent out his "Evidence against Catholicism," and "The Poor Man's Preservative against Popery." Both these works bear marks of the author's inability entirely to forget the cruel wrongs, personal, domestic, and civil, which he had suffered from his unnatural Mother Church. Accordingly he does not evince, as it seems to us, a disposition to make sufficient allowance for the degraded intellectual and social condition of those countries where Catholic

abuses have manifested themselves under the worst forms, or for the fact that, as the countries in question, in the gradual progress of civilization, have elevated themselves in the scale of morals, refinement, and civil freedom, though still continuing Catholic, many of these abuses have disappeared. On the other hand, however, we have abundant cause to admire the fulness of his information and experience as here displayed, which has enabled him, in more than one instance, to convict Mr. Charles Butler, the most candid and plausible, if not the ablest, of the Catholic advocates, either of wilful disingenuousness, or palpable and unaccountable misapprehension. It also gives us pleasure to add, that the tendency of his works against the Catholics is not to awaken acrimony of feeling on either side. He readily concedes that there have been and are among them some of the brightest examples of the Christian character; and, though deeming it neither expedient nor safe to trust political power to any considerable extent even with conscientious and devout Catholics, he still would have them protected, both by law and public opinion, in the right to worship God according to their own convictions of truth and duty. The ground he takes is this: that it is only under governments which are materially modified and controlled by the element of Protestantism in some form or other, that Catholics themselves can properly be said to be free; that the Catholics themselves in England, for example, are now freer and more independent, religiously as well as politically, than they would be, were the Papal ascendency to be reëstablished there, as it exists in Italy and Spain.

His temporary reconciliation to the English establishment in 1824, though it secured to him, while it lasted, the confidence and society of many esteemed friends, could not and did not afford the hoped-for repose of mind. His return to Unitarianism, as the only consistent, Scriptural, and entirely practicable doctrine, ought properly to be dated, it would seem, from 1829; the events of that year doing not a little to open his eyes to the true character of a church to which, unhappily, he was bound by so many adventitious associations. For a time he still conformed, taking refuge as a last resort in a modification of the Sabellian theory; but all would not do. "The *devout* contrivance," he says, "would not bear examination; Sabellianism is only Unitarianism disguised in words." The rest of the story he shall tell himself.

"In this state, however, I passed five or six years; but the return to the clear and definite Unitarianism in which I had formerly been, was as easy as it was natural. An almost accidental (if the result had been to make me a Trinitarian, most people would call it *providential*) correspondence with a gentleman, (then personally unknown to me, and whom subsequently I have seen but once,) who had some years ago resigned his preferment to profess himself a Unitarian, took place during part of last summer and part of the ensuing winter. This was the *occasion* of my becoming aware of the flimsiness of the veil, which had long somewhat concealed from me the real state of my religious belief. This flimsy veil once torn, I had no difficult theological questions to examine; they had all been settled before. Whether I was to continue apparently a member of the Establishment, was a point on which I could not hesitate a moment. For the greatest part of more than twenty years I had employed all my powers, in a manner hardly justifiable except on enthusiastic principles, with the object of continuing in the Church. My only excuse for this, must be found in the religious habits which I deeply imbibed in youth. I do not absolutely reproach myself for having so long indulged the disinterested sympathies which made me linger in connexion with the Church, when my understanding had fully rejected her principal doctrines: at all events, I derive from that fact the satisfaction of being assured, that, far from having embraced Unitarianism in haste, the only fault of which I cannot clear myself is, that of reluctance and dilatoriness to follow my conviction in its favor." — *Ibid.* pp. viii., ix.

We hope that all those who hailed our author's rejection of Catholic superstitions, and his subsequent adoption of the Orthodoxy of the Church of England, as signal manifestations of the *force of truth* on a fair, inquisitive, and able mind, may be willing to see, and have manliness enough to acknowledge the coöperation of the same causes in his conviction and avowal of Unitarian sentiments. To those who, instead of this, are ready to blame him for what they will denominate an unpopular and imprudent step, wholly destructive of his authority and influence with the public, he replies:

"I commit my past services in the cause of Truth (whatever they may be) to the care of that Providence, which, if in fact I have been useful, must have employed me, though a humble instrument. Of *consequences* we are very incompetent judges: on *principles* alone can we depend with confidence and certainty. If the consideration of *usefulness* could be allowed in my case, SPAIN, my native country, would long, long since have had my services. But

dissembling, whether in deference to *Transubstantiation* or the *Athanasian Creed*, is equally hateful to me.

"Yet, why any real good of which I may have been the occasion should be destroyed by a fresh proof of my love of honesty and fair dealing, is what I cannot conceive. If any thing could invalidate or weaken the force of my testimony in regard to the corruptions of Popery, it would be my SILENCE in favor of what I deem other corruptions. The great *Chillingworth* would have added weight to his unrivalled works, if he had not permitted his subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles to remain in full force, when neither his judgment could approve of it, nor his natural honesty conceal his change. As to myself, I have not enjoyed any of the temporal advantages of Orthodoxy; and it is well attested, that, at a time when I might conscientiously have taken preferment, I solemnly resolved never to accept it. But, having subscribed to the Articles for the mere purpose of qualifying myself for the *occasional* performance of clerical duties, I feel bound modestly to recall that subscription before my death; and to declare, that I am satisfactorily convinced, not only that the DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY is not Scriptural, but also that the whole *Patristical* theology, which makes up the greatest part of the Thirty-nine Articles, consists of groundless speculations, which could never have obtained currency among Christians, without the aid of a false philosophy. I profess Christianity as a UNITARIAN; acknowledging ONE GOD IN ONE PERSON, and Jesus of Nazareth as my guide to *His Father* and *my Father*, *His God* and *my God*." — *Ibid.* pp. iv., v.

It will be recollected, that in an extract from one of Mr. White's earlier publications, we gave the suspicions he entertained respecting the practical influences of Unitarianism and Unitarian worship, when from obvious causes he knew nothing about the matter. For the benefit of those who entertain similar suspicions, though convinced that in speculation the argument from Scripture as well as reason is on the side of the Unitarians, we give the following statements of our author, made since he has been in a condition to speak from actual experience.

"I trust I may still venture to add a few words respecting what I have experienced and observed since I fairly and honestly began to act in full conformity with my conviction. Having never before been in any Dissenting place of worship whatever, and conceiving from what I had heard, that the absence of a regular Liturgy in all, and that of real devotion in those of Unitarians, made them quite offensive to persons accustomed to the Church service, I strongly feared I should be obliged to follow Milton's example,

and abstain from public worship. Wishing, however, to satisfy myself by personal observation, I went, soon after my arrival in this town of Liverpool, to one of the Unitarian chapels. The effect which the service produced upon me was recorded in my private journal as soon as I returned to my lodgings; but the passage is too long to be inserted here. Suffice it to declare, as I do in the most solemn manner, that I never enjoyed a more devout and sublime impression than I received there. My almost constantly repeated attendance has not weakened the effect of the truly sublime Unitarian worship with which I have become acquainted. I have since attended divine worship in another chapel of the same denomination; and the original impression has been confirmed. Sunday, which owing to the constant struggle of my mind at church, and the frequent internal rejection of passages in the Liturgy, was formerly to me a day of pain and suffering, is now one of enjoyment. The admirable combination of beautiful hymns, with prayers no less beautiful, and a sermon in which I have hitherto never failed to find instruction and support to my religious feelings, all contribute to make me enjoy the service of the Lord's Day. I must add, that I have never joined congregations in which attention and devotion were more visible in all, including the numerous charity children who attend the service. It is a great misfortune, that the spirit of Orthodoxy stands like 'a great gulf fixed' between Churchmen and Unitarians. Could impartial good men 'come and see,' though they might remain attached to their opinions, they would be certainly delivered from a multitude of most uncharitable prejudices." — *Ibid.* pp. x., xi.

We have left ourselves space to speak but very briefly of our author's two last works. His "*Second* Travels of an Irish Gentleman in Search of a Religion" is the best and most satisfactory answer which has appeared as yet to the sophistry and pedantry of Mr. Moore's noted defence of the Catholics, published a few years since under a similar title. Parts even of the fictitious narrative, though this is obviously a secondary matter with the writer, are sustained with great interest and spirit; and on this account, as well as for the judgment and discrimination with which the work abounds, we recommend it to all, and to those particularly who think to settle theological questions by an appeal to the Fathers, or who are apt to take alarm at the alleged infidel tendencies of Protestantism. We had marked several striking passages for quotation; but must content ourselves with giving the two following, the first of which is taken from a conversation between the "Irish Gentleman" and his Mentor, Mr. Fitzgerald. The latter says:

"I call faith, in general, a persuasion arising, not from direct proofs, but from what I would call a *moral* inference. I say that I would call it a *moral* inference, because I wish to distinguish it from *logical* inference. Perhaps an example will convey my meaning better than any abstract words can do it. But I must request you to keep in mind that I do not use *faith* in the common acceptation of *assent* to inferences from verbal statements of invisible things. I speak of faith in the practical sense of Scripture, i. e. *trust* (πίστις). My example, illustrative of that faith, is this; I have, for instance, lived with Captain Cusiack for several years, under circumstances which have enabled me to become well acquainted with his general character. From that which I know, I have such *faith* in him, that I would trust my life in his hands, if the means by which he intended to preserve it were ever so unintelligible to me. This kind of faith does not depend upon mental excitement; on the contrary, it is a calm and sedate feeling, which has its root in a certain degree of *experience*, but branches out and blooms in that higher region of the soul, which, being above the argumentative faculties, seems exclusively reserved for conscience, — for those moral principles which identify themselves with the soul, and whose operation cannot be distinguished from the energies of the soul itself." — Vol. II. pp. 60 – 62.

Again; in "A Sketch of the Rise of Papal Rome," Mr. Fitzgerald is made to express himself thus in unfolding the origin and root of what he calls "church iniquity."

"A reflecting reader of Church history (and I include under that name those earliest and most authentic documents, *the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles*) must be aware that the Church, from its infancy, grew up into a *Political Union*. The Christian church made its appearance when the Roman empire was hastening to a dissolution. The Romans had robbed almost every known people of its *nationality*, and had finally lost their own in the self-inflicted slavery which arose from their domestic feuds. In this state of things, and only a few years before the utter destruction of Jerusalem (the last and strongest centre of patriotism in the ancient world), Christianity was published. According to the intention of its divine author, his disciples were to form a *spiritual* association, held together by the mutual sympathy of a common temper and feeling. The *unity* of *the spirit* was all that the Apostles had in view when they established the local associations of Christians, to which you now give the very misleading name of *Churches*. Were it possible to change long established names, it would be desirable to adopt an appellation which would not force upon the mind the notions attached to the word *Church* in consequence of

the papal system, known for many centuries under that name. The primitive *communities* of Christians met (as people do who have some lively interest in common) to enjoy and increase that feeling of trust in God through Christ, which has been called Faith; to promote mutual charity among men, and to support each other in the love and practice of general virtue. That order might be preserved and certain offices regularly performed in the name of the *community*, its members appointed men of experience and tried conduct, whom they called *Elders*. Some of these were (probably from the beginning, and according to circumstances,) placed as superintendents over other Elders. This is the most probable origin of that order of *Elders* called *Bishops*.

"But it was morally impossible that these *spiritual communities* should exist for any length of time, without contracting the spirit of the world that surrounded them. In every region, in every town, (to use the expressions of Origen,) the *Church* appeared as another system of country, the country according to God, and raised up by his word.* The truth, however, of the fact so spiritualized in the expressions of Origen, is, that what before was *patriotism*, became now *church party*. And rapid, indeed, as well as extensive, was the operation of the activity which gathered round these new party centres. At first, however, the divine attraction of the religion itself was uppermost with many. Many others probably gathered round the Apostles, not for the sake of *collective power*, (into which both *patriotism* and party spirit resolve themselves,) but rather under a vague notion, that a brotherly equality was to be established in the new society, by means of which, even a comfortable subsistence would be provided for the indigent members.

"These advantageous prospects did not fail to allure the selfishness of the worldly-minded. We see, in the very first days of the association, two hypocrites† endeavouring to improve their condition by joining the *Church*. We soon after find a man of no common stamp, who, as soon as he has been made acquainted with the *Church*, seems irresistibly impelled to consider Christianity a fair field of profitable speculation. There is, indeed, no reason to suspect Simon Magus of hypocrisy in the act of joining the Christians. His meek answer to the indignant reproof of Peter shows his character in a favorable light. He probably was sincere, but, like many of the leading members of the Church in subsequent times, his heart was still in the bond of (Church) iniquity, — the love of power and wealth. Again, the Church was still under the nursing care of the undispersed apostolical college, when it was disturbed by the complaints of a

"* Contra Cels. viii. 75." "† Ananias and Sapphira."

considerable class of converts, who thought themselves wronged in the distribution of their daily allowance. The conduct and feelings of the Apostles on this occasion are remarkable. It is evident from their expressions, that they could not look without misgivings upon this early evil result of the *political* form which the Church was assuming; they show themselves most anxious to get completely rid of concerns, which, perhaps, though inevitable at that time, showed already their worldly, unspiritual, and disturbing tendency. 'It is not reason that we should leave the word of God and serve tables,' * i. e. the *boards* of accounts, which were necessary for the distribution of the funds of the society.

"How would all these evil tendencies increase, as the Christian societies opened their bosom to the crowds of heathens, in comparison with which the original Jewish converts were but a handful! Myriads of slaves existed in the vast provinces of the Roman empire, in a state of misery and degradation. Bordering on the same condition, were the classes who had to support themselves by free labor and petty trade, especially in the conquered countries of the East. This multitude could not but perceive the advantages of putting themselves under the heads of the Christian associations, who were able to assist the indigent out of a well-managed common stock.† In this voluntary association any one might rise to consequenee, to power, and to dignity, by boldness and zeal in favor of the whole body. In this society the wretched found comfort, the friendless met with sympathy, the slave had rights; and while the tribunals of the country recognised that unfortunate class as mere *materials* for judicial evidence, to which *torture* only could give credibility, their new association proclaimed the rights of the slave to humane and equitable treatment, and *enforced* that declaration of rights by means of its daily extending power of opinion over the slave-masters, who had embraced Christianity. Is it credible, that multitudes of this kind should not be *generally* influenced by the passions, which usually actuate all numerous bodies of men who feel a strong bond of union? Could men, who had hitherto been an habitual prey to hopelessness and resentment, begin to perceive their strength, and not become unruly and turbulent parties, when they were organized into churches, with a bishop or leader at the head of each! Would they not, at first, endeavour to enlarge their power, as *a different people* from the Pagans, by a confederation of churches? Would they not afterwards split into par-

"* Acts vi."

"† This practice continued for a long time; indeed, it may be said never to have totally ceased. In the time of Justin, i. e. about the middle of the second century, some churches seem to have had a community of wealth. See Apol. I. § 14, ed. Benedict."

ties composed of various churches, which, like rival petty states, would employ the whole of their respective powers in injuring each other?" — Vol. II. pp. 86–93.

The "Observations on Heresy and Orthodoxy" contain many just, instructive, and profound suggestions, and show that the author's mind, in regard to the subjects here treated of, has been continually advancing. But, we regret to say, it is less likely to be generally read, or generally popular even among those by whom it is read, than either of his preceding works; partly from the nature of the topics, and partly also from an apparent want of a close and logical connexion in the train of ideas, and of a clear and distinct apprehension of the leading and fundamental idea to be enforced. Of the many interesting and valuable portions we shall give a specimen or two; we can do no more. In the fifth letter, which is on the "Pride of Reason," he first shows very conclusively, that a man is to be blamed as guilty of that vice, only when the value he sets on his own share of reason induces him to invade the share of another man. He then proceeds:

"Having found that *pride of reason* is *an aggression upon other men's reason*, arising from an over-estimate of the worth of the aggressor's own, we may now proceed in our inquiry, Who are justly chargeable with pride of *reason*? Is it those who, having examined the Scriptures, propose their own collective sense of those books to the acceptance of others, but blame them not for rejecting it? or those who positively assert, that their own sense of the Scriptures is the only one which an honest man, not under diabolical delusion, can find there? The answer is so plain, that a child, who could understand the terms of the question, might give it. And yet experience has taught me that there is no chance of unravelling the confused ideas which prevent many a well-meaning Christian from perceiving that the charge of pride of reason falls upon the Orthodox. Their own *sense* of the Scripture (such is the dizzy whirl which their excited feelings produce) must be the *word of God*, because THEY cannot find another. *My sense* of the Scripture (for instance) must, on the contrary, be a damnable error, because it is the work of my *reason*, which opposes the word of God, i. e. THEIR sense of the Scriptures; hence the conclusion, that I am guilty of *pride of reason*. 'Renounce that *pride*,' they say, 'and you will see in the Scriptures what we propose to you;' which is to say, '*Surrender your reason to ours, and you will agree with us.*'" — p. 84.

We hope that those among the Orthodox of this country, who are so earnest and hot in their opposition to the Catholics, will read the following extract, and lay it to heart.

"The position of the Orthodox Protestants, who, having renounced only fragments of Popery, cherish its main root in their hearts, is, to me, exceedingly curious, though lamentable. What an awkward defence against Transubstantiation must a Trinitarian make, who accuses the Unitarian of *Pride of Reason*, because he will not admit that the Athanasian Creed is *virtually* contained in the New Testament! I can imagine the cry of triumph which would be raised if a few manuscripts, of high antiquity, were to be discovered in some corner of the East, containing the passage on the *three heavenly witnesses.* And yet such testimony could not be compared, either in point of unanimity or positive assertion, with the words, '*This is my body,— This is my blood.*' I do not believe either *transubstantiation* or the *real presence*; but, wishing to be just and impartial, I must declare that the Protestant clamors against the *Pride of Reason* place the opponents of those Catholic doctrines completely in the power of their adversaries. Let us imagine a short dialogue.

"Catholic. — Why do you not believe what Christ declares in the most positive and clear words?

"Protestant. — Because the expressions, taken in a literal sense, are absurd.

"Catholic. — Are they more absurd than the proposition, *Three is One, and One is Three*? a proposition which you (agreeing with us) consider as the very foundation of the 'Catholic Verity'; though nothing like those words is found in the genuine portions of the New Testament? Do you not consider, besides, that the word *absurd* does not properly apply to physical facts? That one substance be changed into another, implies no *absurdity*; but that *three* distinct persons, *each of whom is God, should be* ONE God, is certainly ABSURD TO US.

"Protestant. — Transubstantiation certainly does not sound so absurd as the statement of the Trinity; but then, on the other hand, we have the testimony of our senses against it.

"Catholic. — The senses, my friend, have nothing to do in the present case, for the *substantial qualities* of bread and wine remain working upon the senses; the substance alone is changed. Surely, you do not object to this kind of philosophy, for it is just that which saves us from contradictions in the statement of the Trinity.

"Protestant. — But can you suppose that Christ, addressing plain men, who never had dreamt of such philosophy, would so depend upon its influence, as to expect that, without any further

explanation, they would understand that the bread and wine had been changed into his own body and blood?

"CATHOLIC. — Do you not, in the same manner, believe that, although there is no direct assertion, no words about Trinity in Unity, which can be compared to '*This is my body*, — *This is my blood*,' Christ left it to be inferred from scattered passages, by the assistance of philosophical speculations about Nature, Substance, Persons, *Mutual-in-being*, &c. &c.?

"PROTESTANT. — My reason submits in the one case, and resists in the other.

"CATHOLIC. — Are you not guilty of pride, — the PRIDE OF REASON? Do you not reject the clearest declaration that language can be conceived to make, because it offends your PRIDE?" — *Ibid.* pp. 98, 99.

Mr. White intimates a purpose of publishing at some future day, a work under this title, "A Sketch of my Mind in England." We can assure him, that whenever it appears, it will be eagerly read on this side the water by multitudes, who have learned already to respect him for his love of the truth, and the sacrifices he has made to it. ED.

NOTICES AND INTELLIGENCE.

The Sacred Offering. Boston. Joseph Dowe. 1836. 12mo. pp. 216. — To those who are looking for a miscellany of religious poetry, in which they may find spiritual nourishment for a solitary hour, or for a quiet family circle, we commend this little volume. It consists of selections, made with taste and judgment, from a series of annuals which have been published in England for a few years past, under the same title, and edited by Mrs. Jevons, the eldest daughter of the late William Roscoe. The authorship also of the greater number of the pieces contained in those volumes may be attributed, we presume, to that lady, and her sister, and other members of the family; though occasional contributions have been furnished from other sources. The pieces which make up the present volume, exhibit a variety of topics, chiefly of a scriptural or devotional character, calculated to interest the mind in its serious moods, and lead it gently to the Father of spirits. The poetry is always above mediocrity, and sometimes very beautiful. We should say that the principal tendency of the selection was to soothe the spirit. It may be conned with profit in the day of affliction. It may be read in the chamber of sickness, and its verses will drop like balm into the patient's heart.

Sacred Memoirs: or Family Instruction, being a History of Moses, the Jewish Lawgiver. Vol. II. Boston: Marsh, Capen, and Lyon. 1835. 12mo. pp. 276. — The first volume in this series appeared some time ago, containing "A History of the Scripture Characters from Adam to Joseph inclusive." A third volume, we are told, is already in preparation for the press, which will give "a history of Joshua, Doborah, Barak, Gideon, Jephthah, Sampson, and Ruth." We cannot go along with the writer in all his speculations; neither can we recommend his work as evincing familiarity with the best authorities in biblical literature. But he has evidently given a good deal of thought to the characters and scenes he undertakes to portray, and expresses himself almost uniformly like a man of sense, candor, and moderation. Accordingly we hardly know of any books easily accessible, and treating on the same subjects, which can be recommended for popular use with so little reserve.

Lectures on the Atheistical Controversy; delivered in the Months of February and March, 1834, at Sion Chapel, Bradford, Yorkshire. Forming the First Part of a Course of Lectures on Infidelity. By the Rev. B. Godwin. With Additions by W. S. Andrews. First American, from the London Edition. Boston: Hilliard, Gray, & Co. 1835. 12mo. pp. 350. — We regret not having been able to obtain or prepare as yet a proper review of this volume. We cannot, however, allow this number to go to press without acknowledging our sense of the obligations under which the American editor has laid the public by causing so interesting and useful a work to be reprinted in this country. Mr. Godwin brings to the task he has undertaken two qualifications, without which it is to no purpose to approach the confirmed skeptic; — acquaintance with the ground on which he stands, and a disposition to meet him there with something better than dogmatism or personal abuse.

New Publications, and Works in the Press. — We learn from the last number of the Biblical Repository, that Gesenius's Hebrew Lexicon, translated by Professor Robinson, will be published in the course of this spring by Crocker and Brewster. Gould and Newman will soon publish a translation of Eichhorn on the Apocalypse, by the Rev. A. Kaufman, of Andover. Two translations of Calvin's Commentary on the Romans are soon to appear; one, by Professor Alden of Williams College, at New York, the other at Philadelphia. The first volume of Hengstenberg's Christology, translated by the Rev. Dr. Keith, is in the press of Gould and Newman. Professor Bush's Commentary on the Psalms, to appear entire in a single volume, and not in numbers as at first proposed, is in great forwardness.

THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

No. LXXIV.

THIRD SERIES — No. V.

MAY, 1836.

ART. I. — *Animal and Vegetable Physiology considered with reference to Natural Theology.* By PETER MARK ROGET, M. D., Secretary to the Royal Society, &c. In Two Volumes. London: William Pickering. 1834. 8vo. pp. 593 and 661. — American Edition of the same Work, Two Volumes, 8vo. Philadelphia: Carey, Lea, & Blanchard. 1836. pp. 408 and 463.

THIS work is the fifth in order of the celebrated Bridgewater Treatises, and is, we think, one of the best of the series. We prefer it to Kirby's treatise in the same series, on the History, Habits, and Instincts of Animals, which is now also before the public, and which we may notice in a future number. Both works are full of entertainment and interest; but Kirby is not unfrequently visionary in his theories, unsound in his inferences, and careless in his facts; faults from which, so far as we can judge, Dr. Roget is remarkably free. They have been equally diligent, however, in the collection of illustrations from the various kingdoms of nature, to bear on the great point which both had in view, the existence and providence of a Supreme Creator, who is nature's Author and God.

Believing with Dr. Roget, that "to Man have been revealed the power, the wisdom, and the goodness of God, through the medium of the Book of Nature, in the varied pages of which they are inscribed in indelible characters;" and believing that the study of that book of nature, is adapted to lead the student to the knowledge, love, and admiration of the

Former and Ruler of all things, we sincerely rejoice in the appearance of treatises, which must promote, in some degree at least, a taste for natural history in its several branches, and prevent by their own serious spirit, a perversion of that taste from the great end. We rejoice to see those who are universally respected as men of science and ability, maintain by their example and authority the noble truth, that as God manifests himself in nature, so the observation of nature will conduct the candid and teachable mind to the acknowledgment of God. It is with us a favorite and delightful opinion, that the influences of the visible universe are elevating and religious, and support a trust in the unseen Creator, and a faith in his invisible world; that holy scripture is engraven on the rocks, and written on the leaves of the trees; that the praise of God is sung by the voice of every creature, and that the frame and powers and life of every creature indicate divine skill, and evince divine care, and direct the contemplative mind to a constantly increasing communion with the Infinite Intelligence, in whom they and we live and move and have our being. We therefore welcome the instructions of every one who holds in sincerity, and preaches with ability, the same opinion, and gains to it more and more converts and disciples. We earnestly desire, that men should be invited and aided, by wise and competent teachers, to become acquainted with nature, convinced as we are, that the knowledge of nature is one great step toward the knowledge of God.

It is nevertheless to be allowed, that some of those who have been eminently versed in the knowledge of God's works, have refused to regard them as God's works, and have been very far from the knowledge and love of God. This has been the case with several of the French naturalists, who have either vitiated the merit of their observations and discoveries by preposterous atheistic theories, or deprived their labors of the moral efficiency which they might have exerted, by maintaining an unbroken and too significant silence concerning the Infinite Cause. But it is altogether unfair to attribute this avowed or understood infidelity, to the influence of the study of nature, or to its want of influence. The source of it is to be looked for in an entirely different direction, — among the fields of the revolutionary French philosophy, whence arose that deadly stream of irreligion, which has stolen down through every region of French literature. All that can be said is,

that the naturalists partake of a national taint of unbelief, well known and greatly to be deplored, deeply infused and difficult of cure. We do not expect them to be religious merely because they are naturalists. Their minds have been brought into a state which resists the holy influences of nature. God compels no one to know and love him. If a man pertinaciously denies the works of nature to be the works of God, no force is put in requisition from on high, to oblige him to alter his sentiments and lift up his heart. If, while he explores the boundless treasures of created things, he determines not to ascribe the work to its Maker, the gift to the Giver, the most admirable contrivances to a Designer, he may be very learned, and will doubtless derive much pleasure and profit from his knowledge,—for so it is ordered by a kind and impartial Providence,—but he will fall far short of the highest end of all attainment; and, choosing to remain deficient, choosing to keep shut his internal eye and ear, no miracle will be worked, no supernatural power will be exerted, to overcome his perversity.

We ought not to omit stating, while speaking of French naturalists, that the acknowledged prince of them all, the sagacious Cuvier, was a believer and a religious man. It is pleasant to be able to say to those with whom great names have great weight, that he who looked more discerningly through nature than any of his countrymen, looked up reverently to nature's God. But, apart from all authority of names, it is evident that the failure of some individuals in the spiritual improvement of knowledge, is no good reason why others may not succeed, by a proper use of their means. No fact can be better established, than that he who takes with him to the observation of nature a candid mind and a feeling heart, will perceive indications of order, adaptation, and design, which are calculated to direct him to the Supreme and Intelligent Cause; and that the more diligently he observes, the more profoundly will he adore.

Nature leads us to God through the paths of design, which are traced with wonderful distinctness and as wonderful variety in all her kingdoms. The principal argument which the study of things visible builds up for the existence and glorious attributes of a Creator, is the argument of design. And it cannot be shaken. It is old, and attempts have been made to prove it unsound; but the mind of man itself is pledged for its solidity.

A fondness for new and ingenious statements, and a distaste for what is often repeated, have thrown a suspicion on the common argument of design which it does not deserve. The argument may be briefly stated thus. A contrivance, adapted to a certain end, supposes a contriving intelligence. Animated nature is a series of such contrivances, and therefore proves the existence of a Mind antecedent to them all, understanding and intending them all, the infinite Author of them all, which infinite Mind is God. This is the simple old argument, which we still assert to be, not unassailable, but unanswerable and indestructible. To object to this argument, that it omits to give a reason why an evident contrivance is to be ascribed to a contriving Mind, or, in other words, why a set of means which are brought together for a particular end, is to be termed a contrivance, seems to us to be trifling with the argument, and nothing more. If the omission is to be formally supplied, it can only be done by saying, that we ascribe the construction of an animated being to a Maker, because we ascribe our own inferior constructions to the operation of human intelligence, and because, from the very nature of our minds, we must ascribe an organized work to some intelligent artificer. This, to be sure, is coming to the ultimate fact in the case. But why the omission of this ultimate fact, which was evidently understood if not stated in the old argument, should be objected to it as a fatal defect, we cannot imagine. As it has been thus objected, however, and with some parade of words, it is well that it should be distinctly supplied hereafter, in all careful statements of the argument. This has been done in the present work of Dr. Roget. The following extract from his introductory chapter on Final Causes, furnishes a fair specimen of the argumentative portion of his book.

"But though it be granted that all the phenomena we behold are the effects of certain causes, it might still be alleged, as a bar to all further reasoning, that these causes are not only utterly unknown to us, but that their discovery is wholly beyond the reach of our faculties. The argument is specious only because it is true in one particular sense, and that a very limited one. Those who urge it, do not seem to be aware that its general application, in that very same sense, would shake the foundation of every kind of knowledge, even that which we regard as built upon the most solid basis. Of causation, it is agreed that we know nothing; all that we do know is, that one event succeeds another

with undeviating constancy. Now by probing this subject to the bottom, we shall find that, in rigid strictness, we have no certain knowledge of the existence of any thing, save that of the sensations and ideas which are actually passing in our minds, and of which we are necessarily conscious. Our belief in the existence of external objects, in their undergoing certain changes, and in their possessing certain physical properties, rests on a different foundation, namely, the evidence of our senses; for it is the result of inferences which the mind is, by the constitution of its frame, necessarily led to form. We may trace to a similar origin the persuasion irresistibly forced upon us, that there exist not only other material objects beside our own bodies, but also other intellectual beings beside ourselves. We can neither see nor feel those extraneous intellects, any more than we can see or feel the cause of gravitation, or the subtle sources of electricity or magnetism. We nevertheless believe in the reality both of the one and of the other; but it is only because we infer their existence from particular trains of impressions made upon our senses, of which impressions alone our knowledge can, in metaphysical strictness, be termed certain.

"Upon what evidence do I conclude that I am not a solitary being in the Universe; that all is not centred in myself; but that there exist other intellects similar to my own? Undoubtedly no other than the observation that certain effects are produced, which the experience I have had of the operations of my own mind leads me, by an irresistible analogy, to ascribe to a similar agency, emanating from other beings; beings, however, of whose actual intellectual presence I cannot be conscious, whose nature I cannot fathom, whose essence I cannot understand. I can judge of the operations of other minds only in as far as those operations accord with what has passed in my own. I cannot divine processes of thought to which mine have borne no resemblance; I cannot appreciate motives of which I have never felt the influence, nor comprehend the force of passions never yet awakened in my breast: neither can I picture to myself feelings to which no sympathetic chord within me has ever vibrated.

"Our own intelligence, our own views, and our own affections, then, furnish the only elements by which it is possible for us to estimate the analogous powers and attributes of other minds. The difficulty of applying this scale of measurement will, of course, increase in proportion to the difference between the objects compared; and although we may conceive that there are powers and intelligences infinitely surpassing our own, the conceptions we can form of such superior essences must necessarily be indefinite and obscure, and must partake of the same kind of imperfection as our notions of the distances of the heavenly

bodies, however familiar we may be with the units of the scale by which those distances are capable of being expressed. When, on the other hand, the objects contemplated are more within the range of our mental vision; when, for instance, they are phenomena that we can assimilate to our own voluntary acts, and in which we can clearly trace the connexion between means and end, then does our recognition of the agency of intellect become most distinct, and our conviction of its real and independent existence become most intimate and assured.

"Such is the kind of evidence on which rests our belief of the existence of our fellow-men. Such, also, is the foundation of our assurance that there exists a Mighty Intellect, who has planned and executed the stupendous works of creation, with a skill surpassing our utmost conceptions; by powers to which we can assign no limit, and the object of whose will is universal good.*" — Vol. I. pp. 24 – 27.

The illustrations which are then given of the analogical process on which the proof of design is founded, are peculiarly happy. The first of these, though not more ingenious than Dr. Paley's illustration of the watch, and perhaps suggested by it, is more picturesque.

"The evidence of design and contrivance in the works of nature carries with it the greatest force whenever we can trace a coincidence between them and the products of human art. If in any unknown region of the earth we chanced to discover a piece of machinery, of which the purpose was manifest, we should not fail to ascribe it to the workmanship of some mechanist, possessed of intelligence, actuated by a motive, and guided by intention. Farther, if we had a previous experience of the operation of similar kinds of mechanism, we could not doubt that the effect we saw produced was the one intended by the artificer. Thus, if in an unexplored country, we saw, moving upon the waters of a lake, the trunk of a tree, carved into the shape of a boat, we should immediately conclude that this form had been given to it for the purpose of enabling it to float. If we found it also provided with paddles at its sides, we should infer, from our previous knowledge of the effects of such instruments, that they were intended to give motion to this boat, and we should not hesitate to conclude that the whole was the work of human hands, and the product of human intelligence and design. If, in addition, we found this boat furnished with a rudder and with sails, we should at once understand the object of these contrivances, and our ideas

"* The view here taken is, of course, limited to *Natural Theology*; that being the express and exclusive object of these Treatises."

of the skill of the artificer would rise in proportion to the excellence of the apparatus, and the ingenuity displayed in its adaptation to circumstances.

"Let us suppose that in another part of this lake we found an insect,* shaped like the boat, and moving through the water by successive impulses given to that medium by the action of levers, extending from its sides, and shaped like paddles, having the same kind of movement, and producing the same effects. Could we resist the persuasion that the Artificer of this insect, when forming it of this shape, and providing it with these paddles, had the same mechanical objects in view? Shall we not be confirmed in this idea on finding that these paddles are constructed with joints, which admit of no other motion than that of striking against the water, and of thus urging forward the animal in its passage through that dense and resisting medium? Many aquatic animals are furnished with tails which evidently act as rudders, directing the course of their progressive motion through the fluid. Who can doubt but that the same intention and the same mechanical principles which guide the practice of the ship-builder, are here applied in a manner still more refined, and with a master's hand? If Nature has furnished the nautilus with an expansible membrane, which the animal is able to spread before the breeze, when propitious, and by means of which it is wafted along the surface of the sea, but which it quickly retracts in unfavorable circumstances, is not her design similar to that of the human artificer, when he equips his bark with sails, and provides the requisite machinery for their being hoisted or furled with ease and expedition?" — Vol. I. pp. 28 – 30.

What pleasant scenes of far away solitudes, and silent and sunny lakes, and light canoes, and cool summer sailing, are here brought before the mind. What a pure spring of kindly piety must have been gushing in the heart of the writer, when he penned those beautiful paragraphs. We will sail with him, and with such as he is, on the great voyage of discovery and knowledge, and let others, if they will, commit themselves to the guidance of those blind pilots who tempt the dark vortices of chance and atheism.

The argument of design is eminently of a cumulative character; each instance of mechanism in the works of nature being an addition to the pile of facts by which it is supported. In accordance with this view, Dr. Roget goes through the

"* Such as the *Notonecta glauca*, Lin., or water boatman, and the *Dytiscus marginalis*, or water beetle."

several classes of organized existence, ascending from the lowest to the highest, from vegetables up to men, and adducing instances, throughout the whole, of the wonderful workmanship of God; of the most curious and inimitable systems of structure, adapted to certain functions, executed after a definite plan, and denoting a wise and mighty and merciful Creator. He commences with the mechanical functions of animal and vegetable economy, which depend upon the simpler properties of matter, and the well-known laws of mechanism. He then proceeds to the consideration of the nutritive or vital functions of the same, which are of a more refined and intricate nature than the mechanical functions, as they involve the chemical properties of organized substances. He rises from these subjects to a description of the faculties of perception and volition, which belong to living animals as sentient and active beings; and lastly he gives an account of the reproductive functions and the phenomena of animal developement.

In pursuing this course, Dr. Roget exhibits those qualities as a writer, which are requisite to the proper treatment of physiological subjects. He is evidently well possessed of the knowledge he would impart. His descriptions, of which the main body of his work necessarily consists, are clear and accurate. His definitions are precise, and the illustrations, by which he fixes them in the reader's mind, are admirably selected, and such as can hardly fail of retaining a place in the memory. Take for instance the manner in which he illustrates his definition of organization.

"Life, which consists of a continued series of actions directed to particular purposes, cannot be carried on but by the instrumentality of those peculiar and elaborate structures and combinations of material particles which constitute *organization.* All these arrangements, both as respects the mechanical configuration and the chemical constitution of the elements of which the organized body is composed, even when apparently most simple, are, in reality, complex and artificial in the highest possible degree. Let us take as a specimen the crystalline lens, or hard central part, of the eye of a cod fish, which is a perfectly transparent, and to all appearance homogeneous, spherule. No one, unaccustomed to explore the wonders of nature, would suspect that so simple a body, which he might suppose to be formed of a uniform material cast in a mould, would disclose, when examined under a powerful microscope, and with the skill of a Brewster, the most refined and exquisite conformation. Yet, as I shall have occasion to specify

more in detail in its proper place, this little spherical body, scarcely larger than a pea, is composed of upwards of five millions of fibres, which lock into one another by means of more than sixty-two thousand five hundred millions of teeth. If such be the complication of a portion only of the eye of that animal, how intricate must be the structure of the other parts of the same organ, having equally important offices! What exquisite elaboration must those textures have received, whose functions are still more refined! What marvellous workmanship must have been exercised in the organization of the nerves and of the brain, those subtle instruments of the higher animal faculties, and of which even the modes of action are to us not merely inscrutable, but surpassing all our powers of conception!" — Vol. I. pp. 59, 60.

Not the least interesting and useful portion of this work, is that which is devoted to the description of the structure and functions of those animals which occupy a place at or near the foot of nature's scale. Many of these are such as come under our common observation, and occasionally excite our particular attention, but concerning which we are very ignorant, and sometimes feel our ignorance to be rather uncomfortable. Such is the *Asterias*, or Star-fish, of which there are several species, but which is not a fish at all. Such is the *Echinus*, or Sea-urchin, or Sea-egg; and such is the *Actinia*, or Animal-flower, both of which genera have also several species under them. How often these are seen, — how often they are taken up in the hand, — how little is known of them. Nay, it is not an uncommon idea, that, because these things are apparently so insignificant, no one has ever taken the trouble, — we believe that is the expression, — *taken the trouble* to examine them, or write about them, or find out where their place is in nature, — if indeed they have a place, and are not anomalies and outlaws. Then there is the *Medusa*, or Jelly-fish, which we see floating and flapping in the water when the weather is calm, or lying helpless on the sand as the tide recedes; has that ever been examined or described? They have all been examined; they have all been described; they have all a place assigned to them in the ranks of creation; they have all a use and office. Their construction is known, their motions have been analyzed, the manner in which they take their food, and the process by which they digest it, have been traced by accurate observation; and a sketch of all this may be found, in a popular and intelligible form, in the treatise before us.

They all belong to the *Zoöphyta*, the fourth and lowest great division of animated nature; but, low as they are, they are not beneath the care of God. He who made us, and placed us in the rank which we occupy — alas! how do we often occupy it? — made them, and placed them in the rank which they occupy, and gave them their share of work and enjoyment.

Who that has ever crossed the Atlantic, has not seen at times in pleasant weather, the rainbow hues of that light little mariner, the Portuguese Man-of-War, as the sailors call him? We have heard it called, by those who aimed to be more correct than the sailors, the Nautilus, and they have thought that in seeing it, they have seen the far-famed Nautilus. But the sailors are the more accurate party by far. They call it the Portuguese Man-of-War; — and who have a better right than they to name the creatures of the sea? They do not rob another creature of its classical appellation, to bestow it on one to which it is altogether unlike. Though they are not naturalists, except in their own way, they have generally seen something of the world, the "watery world" in particular, and they know that a Portuguese Man-of-War is not a Nautilus. The scientific naturalists confirm their decision, and tell us that this animal, which they call the *Physalia*, belongs to the same division of the Zoöphytes, with the creatures already mentioned, while the Nautilus ranks among the *Mollusca*, in the second great division of animated nature; and that consequently there is about as wide a difference and distance between the latter and the former, as there is between a duck and a butterfly. The following is Dr. Roget's brief but pretty description of the Physalia.

"A construction still more artificial is provided in another family of the same order, denominated the *Physalida* or *Hydrostatic Acalephæ*. They have attained this latter appellation from their being rendered buoyant by means of vesicles filled with air, which enable them to float without the necessity of using any exertion for that purpose. The *Physalia*, or Portuguese Man-of-War, as it is called, is furnished with a large air-bladder, of an oval shape, placed on the upper part of the body; and also with a membrane of a beautiful purple color, which, as in the Velella, serves as a sail. These Zoöphytes are met with in great numbers in the Atlantic Ocean, and more especially in its warmest regions, and at a considerable distance from land. In calm weather they float on the surface of the sea, rearing their purple crests, and appearing at first like large air-bubbles, but

distinguishable by the vivid hues of the tentacula which hang down beneath them. Nothing can exceed the beauty of the spectacle presented by a numerous fleet of these animals, quietly sailing in the tropical seas. Whenever the surface is ruffled by the slightest wind, they suddenly absorb the air from their vesicles, and, becoming thus specifically heavier than the water, immediately disappear, by diving into the still depths of the ocean. By what process they effect these changes of absorption and of reproduction of air yet remains to be discovered. Other genera, as the *Physsophora*, have several of these air-bladders; but in other respects resemble the ordinary Medusæ, in having no membranous crest." — Vol. i. pp. 196, 197.

Much has of late years been discovered concerning the *Infusoria*, that wonderfully minute class of beings which has been brought to view by the powers of the microscope. Some kinds of them are so small and so numerous, that it has been computed by Professor Ehrenberg, the chief explorer in this region, that in a single drop of fluid there may be contained five hundred millions, about the number there is of human beings on the face of the earth. It has been ascertained that there are many distinct and permanent genera of these animalculæ; and such has been the perseverance of the abovenamed naturalist, that in their inexpressible diminutive bodies have been verified by him the processes of muscular action, circulation, and digestion! From the abstract which Dr. Roget has given of these discoveries, we take the following account.

"The Infusory animalcules, or *Infusoria*, were so named by Muller, a Danish naturalist, from the circumstance of their swarming in all infusions of vegetable or animal substances which have been kept for a sufficient time. They are, in general, far too minute to be perceptible to the naked eye: it is to the microscope alone, therefore, that we owe our knowledge of their existence, and of the curious phenomena they present: yet even the best instruments afford us but little insight into their real organization and physical conditions. On this account it is extremely difficult to assign their true place in the scale of animals. By most systematic writers they have been regarded as occupying the very lowest rank in the series, and as exemplifying the simplest of all possible conditions to which animal life can be reduced. *Monads*, which are the smallest of visible animalcules, have been spoken of as constituting 'the ultimate term of animality'; and some writers have even expressed doubts whether they really belong to the animal kingdom, and whether they should not rather be considered as the elementary molecules of organic

beings, separated from each other by the effects of chemical decomposition, and retaining the power of spontaneous, but irregular and indeterminate motion. It was conceived that all material particles belong to the one or the other of two classes; the first, wholly inert, and insusceptible of being organized; the second, endowed with a principle of organic aptitude, or capability of uniting into living masses, and constituting, therefore, the essential elements of all organization. According to this view, all vegetables or animals in existence would be mere aggregations of infusory animalcules, which gradually accumulate by continual additions to their numbers, derived from organic matter in the food: so that the body of man himself would be nothing more than a vast congregation of monads!

"This bold and fanciful hypothesis, devised by Buffon, and recommended by its seductive appearance of simplicity, as well as by the glowing style and brilliant imagination of its author, has had many zealous partisans. The new world, which was disclosed to the wondering eyes of naturalists by the microscope, abounding in objects and in phenomena of which no conception could have been formed previously to the invention of that instrument, was peculiarly calculated to excite curiosity, and to inspire the hope of its revealing the secret of the living principle in the arrangement of the atoms of organic bodies. During the greater part of the last century, infusory animalcules were the subject of frequent and laborious microscopical research, and gave rise to endless conjecture and speculation as to their origin, their vitality, and their functions in the economy of nature. Notwithstanding their minuteness, considerable differences of organization were perceived to exist among them: but many naturalists still clung to the idea that monads, the most diminutive of the tribe, and whose very presence can be detected only by the application of the highest magnifying powers, are homogeneous globules of living matter, without organization, but endowed with the single attribute of voluntary motion: and even this property was denied to them by some authors.

"All these fanciful dreams have been dispelled by the important discoveries of Ehrenberg, who has recently found that even the *Monas termo* is possessed of internal cavities for the reception and the digestion of its food; and who has rendered it probable that their organization is equally complex with that of the larger species of infusoria, such as the *Rotifera*, in which he has succeeded in distinguishing traces of a muscular, a nervous, and even a vascular system." — Vol. i. pp. 183 – 186.

The method, by which Ehrenberg arrived at his singular conclusions, is thus stated in another place.

"Ever since the discovery of the animalcula of infusions, naturalists have been extremely desirous of ascertaining the nature of the organization of these curious beings; but, as no mode presented itself of dissecting objects of such extreme minuteness, it was only from the external appearances they present under the microscope, that any inferences could be drawn with regard to the existence and form of their internal organs. In most of the larger species, the opaque globules, seen in various parts of the interior, were generally supposed to be either the ova, or the future young, lodged within the body of the parent. In the *Rotifer*, or wheel animalcule of Spallanzani, a large central organ is plainly perceptible, which was by some imagined to be the heart; but which has been clearly ascertained by Bonnet to be a receptacle for food. Muller, and several other observers, have witnessed the larger animalcules devouring the smaller; and the inference was obvious that, in common with all other animals, they also must possess a stomach. But as no such structure had been rendered visible in the smallest species of infusoria, such as monads, it was too hastily concluded that these species were formed upon a different and a simpler model. Lamarck characterized them as being throughout of a homogeneous substance, destitute of mouth and digestive cavity, and nourished simply by means of the absorption of particles through the external surface of their bodies.

"The nature and functions of these singular beings long remained involved in an obscurity, which appeared to be impenetrable; but at length a new light has been thrown on the subject by Professor Ehrenberg, whose researches have recently disclosed fresh scenes of interest and of wonder in microscopic worlds, peopled with hosts of animated beings, almost infinite in number as in minuteness. In endeavouring to render the digestive organs of the infusoria more conspicuous, he hit upon the fortunate expedient of supplying them with colored food, which might communicate its tinge to the cavities into which it passed, and exhibit their situation and course. Obvious as this method may appear, it was not till after a labor of ten years that Ehrenberg succeeded in discovering the fittest substances, and in applying them in the manner best suited to exhibit the phenomena satisfactorily. We have already seen that Trembley had adopted the same plan for the elucidation of the structure of the hydra. Gleichen also had made similar attempts with regard to the infusoria; but, in consequence of his having employed metallic or earthy coloring materials, which acted as poisons, instead of those which might serve as food, he failed in his endeavours. Equally unsuccessful were the trials made by Ehrenberg with the indigo and gum-lac of commerce, which are always contaminated with a certain quantity of white lead, a substance highly deleterious to all animals;

but, at length, by employing an indigo which was quite pure, he succeeded perfectly. The moment a minute particle of a highly attenuated solution of this substance is applied to a drop of water in which are some pedunculated Vorticellæ, occupying the field of the microscope, the most beautiful phenomena present themselves to the eye. Currents are excited in all directions by the vibrations of the cilia, situated round the mouths of those animalcules, and are readily distinguished by the motions of the minute particles of indigo which are carried along with them; the currents generally all converging towards the orifice of the mouth. Presently the body of the vorticella, which had been hitherto quite transparent, becomes dotted with a number of distinctly circular spots, of a dark-blue color, evidently produced by particles of indigo accumulated in those situations. In some species, particularly those which have a contracted part, or neck, between the head and the body, as the *Rotifer vulgaris*, these particles may be traced in a continuous line in their progress from the mouth, through the neck, in the internal cavities.

"In this way, by the employment of coloring matters, Ehrenberg succeeded in ascertaining the existence of a system of digestive cavities in all the known genera of this tribe of animals. There is now, therefore, no reason for admitting that cuticular absorption of nutritive matter ever takes place among this order of beings. Whole generations of these transparent gelatinous animalcules may remain immersed for weeks in an indigo solution, without presenting any colored points in their tissue, except the circumscribed cavities above described." — Vol. II. pp. 92 – 95.

There is some difference in bulk between these little creatures, so ingeniously investigated, and the mighty whale, whose aorta, or main artery, "is larger in the bore," says Dr. Paley, "than the main pipe of the water-works at London Bridge; and the water roaring in its passage through that pipe, is inferior in impetuosity and velocity to the blood gushing through the whale's heart." But different as they are, in bulk and in organization, the monad and the whale, there is a chain, the links of which may be distinctly counted, which brings and binds them together; there is a grand and regular series, in which they, with all beings of earth, are included. In this series, man also, with regard to his animal nature, occupies a place. But not so with regard to his mental and moral nature. Here the chain is broken, here the series is interrupted, and man "leaves all other animals at an immeasurable distance behind."

"He alone," says our author, "enjoys in perfection the gift

of utterance; he alone is able to clothe his thoughts in words; in him alone do we find implanted the desire of examining every department of nature, and the power of extending his views beyond the confines of this globe. On him alone have the high privileges been bestowed of recognising and of adoring the Power, the Wisdom, and the Goodness of the Author of the Universe, from whom his being has emanated, to whom he owes all the blessings which attend it, and by whom he has been taught to look forward to brighter skies and to purer and more exalted conditions of existence. Heir to this high destination, Man discards all alliance with the beasts that perish; confiding in the assurance that the dissolution of his earthly frame destroys not the germ of immortality which has been implanted within him, and by the developement of which the great scheme of Providence, here commenced, will be carried on, in a future state of being, to its final and perfect consummation."—Vol. II. p. 580.

Could we follow Dr. Roget through his connected course of exhibitions of divine workmanship in the structure of organized beings, and present to our readers instance after instance of the remarkable adaptations which have either come before his own observation, or which he has culled with great judgment from works of acknowledged authority, we should be sure of communicating both entertainment and instruction to those who have not seen his volumes; but for this we have neither time nor room. We cannot forbear, however, making one more extract from the work, taken from the chapter on the "Decline of the System." On our own feelings, after we had accompanied the writer in his descriptions of the rise, the developement, and the various forms, uses, and arrangements of that system, the passage had an effect like the solemn catastrophe of a poem. But even apart from the connexion in which it stands, it will commend itself by its great beauty.

"The period prescribed for its duration being at length completed, and the ends of its existence accomplished, the fabric can no longer be sustained, and preparation must be made for its inevitable fall. In order to form a correct judgment of the real intentions of nature, with regard to this last stage of life, its phenomena must be observed in cases where the system has been wholly entrusted to the operation of her laws. When death is the simple consequence of age, we find that the extinction of the powers of life observes an order the reverse of that which was followed in their evolution. The sensorial functions, which were the last perfected, are the first which decay; and their decline is found to commence

with those mental faculties more immediately dependent on the physical conditions of the sensorium, and more especially with the memory, which is often much impaired, while the judgment remains in full vigor. The next faculties which usually suffer from the effects of age are the external senses; and the failure of sight and of hearing still farther contributes to the decline of the intellectual powers, by withdrawing many of the occasions for their exercise. The actual demolition of the fabric commences whenever there is a considerable failure in the functions of assimilation; but the more immediate cause of the rapid extinction of life is usually the impediment which the loss of the sensorial power, necessary for maintaining the movements of the chest, creates to respiration. The heart, whose pulsations gave the first indications of life in the embryo, generally retains its vitality longer than any other organ; but, its powers being dependent on the constant oxidation of the blood in the lungs, cannot survive the interruption of this function; and on the heart ceasing to throb, death may then be considered as complete in every part of the system.

"It is an important consideration, with reference to final causes, that generally long before the commencement of this

'last scene of all,
That ends this strange eventful history,'

the power of feeling has wholly ceased, and the physical struggle is carried on by the vital powers alone, in the absence of all consciousness of the sentient being, whose death may be said to precede, for some time, that of the body. In this, as well as in the gradual decline of the sensorial faculties, and the consequent diminution both of mental and of physical sensibility in advanced age, we cannot fail to recognise the wise ordinances of a superintending and beneficent providence, kindly smoothing the path along which we descend the vale of life, spreading a narcotic mantle over the bed of death, and giving to the last moments of departing sensation the tranquillity of approaching sleep." — Vol. II. pp. 622 – 624.

As the structure and functions of animals can hardly be spoken of in many cases, without some notice of their "history, habits, and instincts," which depend upon and grow out of their structure and functions, it was a difficult task for Dr. Roget to avoid interfering with the department assigned to his colleague, the Rev. Mr. Kirby. Considering this difficulty, he has kept within his own domain with praiseworthy exactness, and the two treatises will be found to throw light on each other. The reader who has well perused them both, will rise up no mean proficient, for general purposes, in the kindred sciences of natural history and natural theology.

Neither of these works, however, is calculated or intended to supersede "the unrivalled and immortal work of Paley," as Roget himself terms it. They are both much more methodical, in a scientific point of view, than Paley's, and in this respect superior to it; but, as a theological argument, Paley's has the advantage, in fulness, in precision, and in variety; and there is, besides, an idiomatic and easy stream of style running through it, a charm, a happiness about it, which make it universally popular and useful, and which entitle it to the name of "unrivalled and immortal." F. W. P. G.

ART. II. — *De l'Influence des Mœurs sur les Lois, et de l'Influence des Lois sur les Mœurs.* Par M. MATTER. Paris. 1832. 8vo. pp. 475.

M. MATTER brings to the question of the reciprocal influence of manners and laws, proposed by the French Academy, an acute mind, a philosophical spirit, and extensive erudition. He succeeds in disengaging, and bringing forth to the light, truths of the greatest importance to the statesman and the philanthropist. The work before us is only a *résumé* of a larger one not yet completed. It is divided into four parts. The first part is taken up with general remarks on the question to be discussed, and on the sense in which the terms *manners* and *laws* are used by the author. The second part treats of the influence of manners upon laws; the third of the influence of laws on manners; and the fourth contains views and observations on the means offered by the reciprocal influence of manners and laws for the social melioration of nations.

The general facts, which, according to M. Matter, should serve as the basis of every political measure and of every species of legislation having for their object the glory and prosperity of nations, are these.

1. The influence of manners, — tastes, habits, customs, morals, on laws, and of laws on manners, is not always equally strong. It depends on circumstances, is variously modified, but it is always profound. Manners inspire laws, laws modify manners. Generally one is the copy, the expression, of the other. Sometimes, however, they are not in harmony. When

they are not, the social state is deranged, is in peril. But when the tendency of either is generous, moral, popular, and when the authority that directs them is the same, the danger of the conflict is not great. In opposite cases there is only disorder and revolt, or corruption and decline, in empires.

2. Manners exercise a stronger action than laws. They are anterior, they belong more intimately to man, are, so to speak, the man, the nations themselves. Laws come later than manners. They must necessarily resemble them, support themselves on them, and borrow from them their power. They have a strong and permanent authority only as they are recommended by established habits, dictated by general opinion, and sanctioned by the public adhesion. In this happy condition, laws give to manners the most august sanction, protect them, honor them, and assure them a salutary ascendency in all classes of society.

3. Manners without laws lose their purity, fail in force and influence. Laws without manners are null. "In vain," says Socrates, "are the walls of the Portico covered with laws. It is not by decrees, but by principles of justice deeply imprinted in the hearts of its citizens, that a state is well governed."

4. In the progress of the moral and legal civilization of nations, sometimes the laws, sometimes the manners are found in advance. Here it is the developement of manners, there it is the developement of legislation, that precedes. But whichever may precede, one always gains by what the other gains. The progress of law always leads to a progress of morality or of the individual, and a legislation having at all times in view the moral interests of humanity, so far from being a chimera, is the only legislation deserving the name. Every other is insufficient, defective, pitiable.

5. Manners have a greater importance than laws, for the prosperity of empires. Where they are very bad, good laws are impossible. Without good manners the best laws have but a feeble influence, and are often inoperative or mischievous. Without good manners or without good laws there is no life for nations, and the corruption of both is the most active cause of their ruin.[1]

According to M. Matter, to labor "to establish, preserve, and perfect the public morality is the most sacred duty of government." It should attach itself to the dominant senti-

ment, idea, tendency of a people, and direct all its laws to this end. This is the first means offered by the reciprocal influence of laws and manners for the social melioration of nations. The second means to be adopted to obtain the same end, is the moral and political education of the people, and the third, the education of the young. The first means will never be successfully applied without the other two. Education then, both of the people and of children, is in reality the only efficient means of all social, as it is of all individual, progress.

But there may be a question as to the schoolmaster. Who shall determine and impart the education? The king of Prussia has decided in favor of government. He has made himself the schoolmaster of his people, and is taking good care to educate them to be faithful to an authority which does not tolerate one particle of political liberty. In his hands, education, instead of being a means of social progress, becomes a means of preventing it. Despotism was never so politic before. It is turning the weapons of Reformers against themselves. In the hands of the Catholic Church, education would be made to uphold the popedom and prevent the increase of religious light and liberty. In the hands of our own government, it would be turned to the especial benefit of the opinions or interests of the party in power for the time being. For ourselves we have no great faith in the fitness of any government, nor of any constituted body, civil, political, or religious, to be charged with the education of the people or of children. All constituted bodies have, or are prone to imagine that they have, peculiar rights and interests, and these peculiar rights and interests will almost invariably preside over the education they command or tolerate.

But waiving this, no government, no government on earth, is qualified to determine the education to be given the people. The wisdom of government can never rise above the average of the wisdom of the individuals who compose it. Allow that these individuals, — which is far from being the fact in any country, — are the wisest and best men of the nation, and it by no means follows that they are qualified to decide, authoritatively, what ideas, what sentiments are proper for the people, or what instruction should be given to children. There are few who would not call in question their infallibility, and the expediency of giving up their own understandings to

theirs. No education can be complete, can be what it ought to be, that does not instruct both people and children in reference to the end for which man was made, and fit them to attain it. The destination of man and of society, and the means of marching steadily and straight forward towards it, are the subject matter of all useful education ; and surely it is no want of charity to say, that governments are in respect to these, at least, but very little in advance of the people. They need education themselves as well as the people ; and they must in fact receive theirs from the people, for the people always exercise a stronger action on government, than government does on them. Government, then, cannot be the schoolmaster for the people, nor for children. It may, as it is in duty bound, make all the provision for the education of both that it can, but it must not attempt to decide what the education shall be.

But it is necessary that both people and children be rightly educated. The education of the people is even more important than that of children ; for it is their education which decides the character and measures of government, and determines the education of the young. The importance of educating the young, the rising generation, is, in this country at least, widely and deeply felt. We allow, we contend, that all children should be well educated, and we have done and are doing much that they may be. But our own education, so far as relates to ideas, sentiments, to that which constitutes the soul of our education, will be the measure of that we give to our children. Allow that we of the present, acting generation, have incorrect notions on the destiny of man and of society, that we do not rightly perceive and fully comprehend the true end which man in his individual and social acts should always keep in view, and it would evidently follow that we are not qualified to instruct dogmatically those who are to take our places. The education we give to our children must be incomplete, erroneous, if not mischievous. Not a little of the education received by a large portion of the children of our country, is perhaps only better than none. We need but look into a multitude of tracts and sabbath-school books, which are constantly issuing from the Orthodox presses of the country, to be convinced of this fact. Those tracts and books educate, to a certain extent, our children ; but they educate them not for their true destiny, not for the future, but for the

past. Now, there is no remedy for this, but in the education of the grown-up generation, but in having the people possess right ideas on the destination of man and of society, in having them clearly perceive and fully comprehend, so far as it is given to finite beings, what man and society may be, and what they ought to be.

We would not have it understood by these remarks that we wish to relax exertions for the education of children. We believe with the Spartan lawgiver, that "the principal part of legislation is the right education of youth," and with a wiser than he, "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it." But this we contend is impossible, unless the people themselves know the way in which he should go. It is vain to ascribe this knowledge to any great extent to the people of any country. Enlightened as we think ourselves in this country, we do not fully possess it. Our notions on what education should be, are vague and contradictory. If our own government were qualified to determine for us, its determinations would have no weight. Some want their children educated to be Calvinists, some to be Catholics, some to be Episcopalians, some to be Methodists, some to be Universalists, some to be Unitarians, and some to be believers in no religion. In this case the most government can do is, so far as its own schools are concerned, to disregard the wants of all parties, and prohibit all sectarian and, as things are, virtually all religious instruction; which is, in fact, prohibiting instruction in what it most concerns us to know.

This evil is a great one. It is beginning to be widely and deeply felt. But there is no remedy but in the education of the people. The education of children has long held a prominent place, but the education of the people has not till lately received much direct attention. Neglected it has not been, but it has not been provided for and pursued systematically, designedly. It has seldom been presented as a distinct topic of consideration, and as an indispensable prerequisite to the right education of children. But we think it highly important that it should be. Let the people be educated, that is, let them have just ideas on whatever can affect man as a moral, religious, or social being, and they would soon devise and carry into effect the proper education for children. Ideas are not powerless. They may operate silently, slowly, but

in the end they prove themselves omnipotent. They pass from mind to mind, from heart to heart, and generate a moral force, that breaks out eventually with irresistible energy and changes the whole face of society. Just ideas are what is needed. The most important service which man can render his fellow beings is to diffuse just ideas on the destiny of man and society. To do this is to educate the people; and when the people are truly educated, enlightened, a sound and vigorous national and individual morality will not be slow to follow.

But the question now recurs, Who are to be the educators of the people? Not governments, we have decided, because they need to be educated themselves. We want the influence of a body of men from which both governments and people shall receive their character. Where is this body to be found? We answer, unhesitatingly, it ought to be found in the Christian Ministry. The Christian clergy are designed to be the chief educators of the people. They act directly on the ideas of the people. They are concerned with every sphere of man's duty, with that which relates to his neighbour and society, as well as with that which relates to himself and to his God. They are the schoolmasters for adults, "public teachers of piety, religion, and morality," as they are denominated in our "Bill of Rights," and it is their mission to give lessons on whatever affects man as an individual or a social being, for time or for eternity.

In pronouncing the Christian clergy the educators of the people, we would not be understood as claiming for them the right to teach dogmatically. The question of the destiny of man and of society is not yet settled, and, till it be, instruction should be as little dogmatic as possible. The clergy, no more than governments, are infallible. There are few of them who do not need instruction themselves. They must inquire rather than dogmatize. They must educate by arousing and directing the attention of the people, by revealing to their minds their unexerted powers, and pointing them to the means of individual and social progress not yet adopted. They must study to set the people to work in the right direction, and educate them by inducing them to educate themselves. They are to act on free minds, and that not to control them, but to quicken and strengthen them. They must convince, not dictate; persuade, not compel.

But we may be told that the clergy are doing all this now. Not all of it. They seem to us to restrict themselves to one part, — an important part, we admit, — of their mission. They seem to consider that the individual element is the only element of religion, and that that element is mainly important simply as it relates to another world. They confine their mission too exclusively to what is technically called the "cure of souls," and seem to think that they should depart from their duty, if they should labor for the social well-being of man in his present mode of existence. They interpret in a wrong sense the words of Jesus, "My kingdom is not of this world," so as to make them mean, not that the moral kingdom of Jesus was to be based on principles wholly different from those on which were based the moral and political kingdom of his epoch, but that he really intended to establish no kingdom except for the world after death. This world, society and all its direct interests, they seem to imagine to belong of right to some other class of instructors. The consequence is, that they give no direct instructions on the destination of society, do little to awaken a zeal and quicken exertions for social progress. They aim indeed to perfect the individual, but not society. In this they overlook the social, if we may so speak, the material elements of religion.

Now, we affirm that Christianity was designed to aid social as well as individual progress; and if so, the clergy have no more right to overlook the social element, than they have to overlook the individual element. Undoubtedly the first concern of Christianity is to perfect the individual, to fit him for that glorious social state into which the good will enter after death; but it contemplates also the fitting of him for a more perfect social state here. The angels sang "*On earth*, peace and good will toward men," as well as "Glory to God in the highest." It was on earth that Jesus proposed to establish a kingdom of righteousness and peace, as well as in the world after death. And, indeed, so far as he gave us any instruction on the subject, he taught us that the surest pledge of a heaven hereafter, is the creation of one here. In perfecting the individual, reference then may be had to his earthly mode of being. That mode of being comes within the precincts of the clerical mission. If it does, we know not why the clergy have not a right to touch upon society, point out social abuses, what society is, what it may be, what it ought to be, what are the

means of its progress, what man has a right to demand of it, and what it in return has a right to exact of him.

Allow, however, that the perfection of the individual is the sole object of Christianity, this subject can never, to any considerable extent, be obtained without the perfection of society. Man has his social side, social faculties, duties, rights, and interests. Leave out these, and his character will want symmetry, fail in completeness. Perfect every individual, and undoubtedly you would perfect society; but it is necessary that the perfection of both be carried along together. Out of society, in a cave or cloister, a part of man's nature must remain undeveloped, or be developed but to wither and die. Man can live and grow only in society. His growth effects a growth of society, and that growth of society reacts upon him and effects a new growth. But, in some states of society, there must be a social growth before there can be, — in relation to a part of the community, — an individual growth. Many individuals may occupy a position in the social state that precludes the possibility of the growth of any part, except the animal part, of their nature. These individuals never compose the whole of any community, but their number may be great. Of themselves they cannot rise. The man within them cannot germinate and spring up and expand into beauty or ripen into moral worth, unless watered and cherished by those who occupy a more favorable position. Society bears them down, tramples them in the dust; and may not the clergy urge their claims, and urge them even in loud and earnest tones? May they not point to the imperfections of that social state, where multitudes of human beings, endowed with a noble nature, are by the action of causes which exceed their energy or power to control, doomed to live and die mere animals. And in pointing out these imperfections, may they not direct attention to the discovery and application of a remedy? If they may not, how can they labor successfully for the perfection of all the individuals composing a community?

But it may be objected to this, that it would carry the clergy from the *actual* to the *possible*, from what is to what ought to be. We hope it would. The church from its beginning has been strangely inconsistent. In relation to the individual it has always been going from the actual to the possible, from what is to what should be. It never tells the sinner his actual condition must be preserved, that he must indulge in no vision-

ary schemes of improvement, that innovations are dangerous, and that it is safest not to depart from the old landmarks. But it always attempts to make him discontented, and feel that his condition is most miserable. And it presents him, too, visions of a better state, and urges him by motives attractive as heaven, and terrible as hell, to gain it. In relation to society all this is changed. Here the actual is approved, and departure from it condemned. "Undoubtedly, indirectly, by softening the manners, exalting the sentiments, decrying or abolishing many barbarous practices, the church has powerfully contributed to the improvement of man's social condition."* But directly it has done nothing. It has done worse than nothing. It has generally given its aid to despotism, lent its spiritual ægis to shelter the civil tyrant in his war against the progress of society. Why this difference? In the most favored parts of the world society is imperfect, and its imperfections must in the eyes of a just God excuse many of the imperfections of individuals: why not then labor to perfect it? What, indeed, is the great mission of life, but to go from the imperfect to the perfect? And can it be less Christian to go from the imperfect to the perfect in relation to society, than it is in relation to the individual?

It may be alleged, that, should the clergy bring out the social element and labor for the perfection of society, they would soon lose themselves in a land of shadows, and merely amuse the people with dreams. Be it so, then. Even dreams are sometimes from God. Those visions of something better than what is, which are for ever coming to the minds and the hearts of the gifted and the good, are our pledges of a higher destiny. They familiarize us with loftier excellence, enchant us with a beauty superior to that of earth, and quicken within us the power to do and to endure every thing to realize them. They may never be realized. It may be best that they should not. But the soul's struggles to realize them always make us stronger and better. We envy no one who has them not. No one ever attained to eminence who did not see mountains rising far above the highest he could reach. There flit before the "mind's eye" of the greatest masters in painting and sculpture, forms of beauty which infinitely surpass their skill to transfer to the canvass or the marble. The immortal sons of

* See on the influence of the Church, Guizot's "Moderne Civilisation en Europe. Leçon VI." Paris: 1828.

song have visions of intellectual greatness and moral worth, of which even their happiest numbers can give us but a faint conception. Yet it is to their daily and nightly communing with these beings of the ideal, to their continual efforts to seize and embody them, that they are indebted for the excellence they attain. It is, in fact, to the soul's power to go off from the actual to the possible, to conceive something greater and better than what is, that we are indebted for all our improvements. The soul goes before the body. It seizes upon heaven while its clog of clay drags upon the earth. It is well that it is so. It is the condition of all progress. Let the soul then be ever breaking away from the present, seeking a serener heaven, a warmer sun, and greener fields in the future; it is but its effort to return to God, of whom it carries with it, wherever it goes, an inward sentiment and an undying love.

Of course we would not lose sight of the practicable. But where does the practicable end? Till the limits of thought be discovered, and the depths of love be sounded, no one can tell. Man has within him powers which have slept from creation; and who is prepared to say what he may not achieve, when they shall be once awakened and put forth in all their energy? Certainly we would not lose ourselves in the ideal, nor indeed do we think there is much danger of doing it in this materializing age. There may be epochs when men are too much engaged in building castles in the air, and in peopling them with the creatures of their own imagination. But ours is not one. We are too much engrossed with the outward, the tangible, the material, to be in much danger of losing ourselves in the ideal. We say, then, let the clergy bring out the social element of Christianity, and direct their attention, and that of their congregations, to the work of perfecting society. Let them take generous views of what society ought to be, and of what it may be. And if they turn out to be dreamers, let them not lose their self-respect. We would rather dream with Plato, than reason with Hobbes and Machiavelli.

We trust we shall not be misinterpreted. We are not urging governments to attempt to realize the crude projects of mere day-dreamers. We are among those who are willing that government should move "slowly and surely," never departing from a settled line of policy without urgent and satisfactory reasons. We are not now speaking of the duty of governments, but of the clergy as educators of the people. In

the education they give, we would have the clergy connect the present with the future. We would have them educate the people with special reference to progress both in the individual and in society. We would have them preach the progress of humanity and of society, progress in the spiritual and in the material order, turn all minds and hearts towards it, convince them of its practicability, and kindle a deep and becoming enthusiasm to effect it.

If, however, we may be our own interpreters, we would not have progress preached to the detriment of order. We yield to none in our love of order. Order is heaven's law. But order, except in a very incomplete sense, is nowhere as yet attained. Disorder now reigns in the individual and in the social state; and this is the reason why we desire progress, which, if it be progress and not retrogression, is only a continued approach to order, a continued effort of man and society to place themselves in harmony with the universal order which is God.* Nor would we have progress so preached as to arouse angry feelings. We want no indignation, no condemnation. Jesus Christ came not to condemn the world, but to save it. The *Christian* ministry can follow no example but his. It will indulge no bad feelings itself, and it will avoid as much as possible the arousing of any in others. Love is the dominant principle of all good education, whether for old or young; and love is the lever with which the clergy must raise man and society to their destiny.

In contending that the clergy should labor more directly for the melioration of society, than they have hitherto done, we by no means forget the excuse, if not the justification, of their past conduct. It is easy to perceive the reason why this world has entered so little into their instructions. Christianity was like "leaven" deposited in the mighty mass of religious notions generated by the Grecian and Oriental worlds. For a time it must be concealed, and seem lost; and it was only after ages of silent and secret working, that it could succeed in leavening the "whole lump." Those religious notions, which Greece and the East had given the world, must therefore for a long time be predominant; and the history of the Church proves that they did reign for a long time, and that some of

* See "Mélanges Philosophiques, par Théodore Jouffroy." Paris: 1833. Article, "Du Bien et du Mal."

them have been very powerful down to our own times. The Grecian world was indeed human, material, social. But its religion was from the East, from Egypt and India, and there all is mysticism. Not all, perhaps, but mysticism predominates there, — gives its character and direction to men's thoughts, feelings, and pursuits. From them mysticism passed into the Church, sometimes reigned, or nearly reigned in it, and at all times tinged its doctrines and exerted an influence over its practice.

Now what is the view which mysticism gives us of this life, of this world? In the eyes of the mystics, this world is not worth a thought or a wish. The earth is a "wretched land," unable to "yield us any supply." Sublunary bliss is impossible. Man sees around him only the spectacle of sin and misery. His life is a continual warfare. He obtains not a morsel of bread, not a covering for his body, without a war with matter. Nothing is obtained without an effort, and all effort must end in fatigue, and generally in disappointment. Man's condition here is that of punishment. Every thing is opposed to his well-being. The body with its wants, society with its importunities, its petty ambitions, its vain pursuits, its friendships, its sorrows, its temptations, its vices and crimes, are for ever interposing between the soul and its good, rending it away from God, and compelling it to sigh and seek in vain for repose.

With this view of man's earthly mode of being, how could the thought of laboring for it find admittance? Life was death, and society the grave. We were not placed in this world to live, but to endure. It is not our home. We are strangers and sojourners here. We are pilgrims, seeking a city whose maker is God, as though God were not the maker of this as well as of all other worlds. Here all is toil and fatigue; and what would we have religion to be but a star of hope to guide us over "life's tremulous ocean," to the haven of everlasting rest, to our eternal home, where all our toils will be over, where there will be no more fatigue, where the soul may repose for ever beneath the sun-light of the Lord? What is life, what is the world, that they should detain us here? Scorn them, — deny them, — think only of heaven, only of gaining a blissful "mansion in the skies."

This view of life, of this world, of the true object of pursuit, though it has never completely triumphed in the church, has always made the grand staple of its sermons, exhortations, prayers, and hymns. With this view, it would hardly seem a

duty for the clergy to labor for the melioration of society. And this view is not without some show of truth. It is true that we can in this world obtain only a part of the good promised us by our nature, and it is true that we gain nothing without effort, and that all effort is followed by fatigue. All this is true. But, if we cannot obtain all the good our nature promises, we may obtain a part of it; if we cannot achieve our destiny here, we may commence it and march towards our end.* If we can obtain nothing without effort, it is in effort that we grow, in effort that the soul is developed and becomes strong and healthy. Repose after toil is sweet, but endless repose were endless death. Give to the soul perfect rest, and you annihilate it. Action is its life. And for action this world is fitted. It has its pains and its pleasures, its joys and its sorrows, its hopes and its fears, its struggles and its rests, its alternations of light and darkness, every thing needed to touch the soul on every side, to quicken and exert all its faculties. It is then rather a state of trial than of endurance, — of discipline, and not of punishment. It need not be contemned. It is useful to the soul. It is God's world, and to slight it were to fail in reverence to God.

The New Testament also in some places seems to favor this view of the mystics. But it is only in appearance. It condemns worldly-mindedness, but worldly-mindedness can hardly be confounded with the philanthropic desire to make the world the abode of peace and love. It forbids us to expect happiness from the world, but not to hope and labor for it in the world; it assures us the earth cannot yield us a supply, but not that no supply can be obtained while we are on the earth. It requires us to mortify the body; yet it does not mean that the body has not its place, its rights, and its uses, but that we should not be governed by its propensities, that we should yield ourselves servants only to our higher, our spiritual nature. It teaches us that our main effort should be to gain heaven, but heaven may be here, in a degree, as well as hereafter; that our only good is in God, but God is on this

* We refer our readers for a fuller developement of the views offered in this and the two preceding paragraphs, to Professor Jouffroy's "Cours [for 1833 and 1834,] de Droit Naturel. Cinquième Leçon. Système Mystique."

side the grave as well as on the other. He is in every good man's heart. He is found only in being good and in doing good. We may be good in this world and for this world, and do good for this world, without in the least unfitting ourselves for another. Man has a destiny on earth, in time as well as in eternity, and the path that leads to his destiny here is the true road to that hereafter, for both are but one and the same destiny. If he has a destiny here, he has duties here, and if duties here, the world is not beneath his notice.

While, however, the notion prevailed that this world is but a place of punishment, while it was considered an enemy, life a wearisome load, and heaven after death the only thing worth laboring for, the clergy could not preach and act much otherwise than they did. There was then no place for the social element. If they had brought it out, it would have been unheeded. The state of society itself, during the centuries which immediately succeeded the introduction of Christianity, was such as must almost inevitably turn men's minds in the direction of mysticism. Every thing was unsettled. There was nowhere any security. All was fleeting. The earth seemed abandoned by its Maker to the merciless hordes of barbarians that overrun it. There was no faith in it, no heart to labor for its improvement, and no cause to wonder at the thousands of monks and anchorites who filled the deserts and monasteries.

But this state of things is now changed, and the clergy must change with it, or lose their influence, and be themselves numbered with the things that were. The clergy, no more than governments, can have any authority without attaching themselves to the dominant sentiment or idea of the people. The secret of their influence is in their being the best representatives, impersonations, of the sentiments of their age and country, or of those on whom they are to act. The dominant spirit of their epoch is their *point d'appui*, which must cover and support all their operations. The history of the clergy since the Reformation, affords lamentable proof of the truth of this assertion. Before the Reformation, the church was hardly called to preach social progress. The spiritual order then was every thing, the material order nothing, except as it served the church. Man was something, but society was not. Individual progress might then be preached, but not social progress. The time had not yet come. The Reformation

changed the face of things. It was in many respects the installation of society. It brought up the state, and prepared the way for the social element to become operative. This was a new state of things. The clergy should have accepted and conformed to it. As men, some of them did; but, as clergymen, the greater part rejected it and continued to pray, sing, and preach, in the spirit of the church before the change had been effected.

And what has been the consequence? Its consequences have been, in the first place, to lessen the influence of the clergy, till in those countries in which social progress has been the greatest, it is now almost too trivial to be named; and, in the next place, to throw the direction of the social progress into the hands of those whose enmity the Church had aroused, and whose minds were imbittered against religion itself from its supposed hostility to social reform. It is therefore, that infidelity is so prominent a feature in modern civilization. The social element, being refused by the clergy, was taken up by unbelievers; and, in proportion as the social element gained upon the individual element, unbelievers gained upon the clergy. And their gain has been great. In literature, perhaps we do not hazard too much in saying the infidel sentiment reigns. Scarcely a writer who takes a wide and deep hold upon the public mind, but seems to owe his success to his sympathy with doctrines generally disavowed by the clergy. Religion and society are at war. To a great extent the clergy adhere to the progress of humanity alone, while the opponents of the clergy are clamorous for the progress of society. Exceptions we know there are, but we are speaking merely of dominant tendencies; and what we say of these was, perhaps, much truer at the close of the last century than now. Since then the influence of ministers of religion may have been on the increase. But their increased influence must be traced to the fact, that since then they have labored much more for society than they ever did before.

We say to the *fact*, and we say it designedly, for we do not perceive that there has been any material change of theory. The principle contended for is the same as it was. Social melioration, except in a theological sense, as it is to be effected by proselyting and converting, does not seem to be yet allowed by the clergy generally to be a Christian object, any more than it was before the Reformation. The energy,

which would have been directed to the improvement of society properly so called, has been beguiled into an apparently social channel, but it will soon discover that it is not yet in the right channel, and then, if the clergy do not accept it, they are prostrate. The real dominant sentiment of our epoch is that of social progress. It is in vain to war against it. The clergy, during their centuries of labor for individual progress, have prepared the way for it. It has come. It will have its day. It will reign till the progress of society equals that which has been made by individuals. It should be accepted. To accept this is what we are urging upon the clergy. We believe it their duty to accept it, and we are confident that to accept it is the only means they have left to recover their influence and save the world from infidelity.

We say the dominant sentiment of our epoch is that of social progress. We think we cannot be mistaken in this. If the developement and growth of the social element be not the dominant sentiment of the age, we would ask, what mean these demands for social reform which come to our ears on every breeze, from every land? What mean these movements among the people, these combinations of even workingmen to meliorate society? What mean these shakings of thrones, these fears, which penetrate the hearts of kings, fill courts with consternation, and make those who live by existing abuses turn pale? There is no mistaking the spirit of the times. We see it everywhere, we see it in new sects, in the abortive attempts of the Saint-Simonians, in the new French Catholic Church, insignificant as it may be. We saw it in the deep sensation produced by the whimsical Owen, when he first announced his new social system; we felt it in the thrill which ran through our hearts, and heard it in the loud burst of sympathy which broke from the whole civilized world, at the news of the French Revolution of July, 1830. We see it in the influence of such writers as Jeremy Bentham, Byron, and Bulwer. We see it, and not the least plainly, in the humble but powerful ministry to the poor in *this* city as well as in some others. All these and a thousand other circumstances, we could mention, had we room, are proofs to us, that men's minds and hearts are busy with the social state, and that the real sentiment of our epoch is the sentiment of social progress. To this sentiment the clergy must attach themselves. The time for star-gazing has gone by. They must look on the

earth, and exert themselves to make it the abode of peace and love. This is the only way in which they can recover a permanent influence, and be widely and lastingly useful. They neglected to accept the social element, when they might have done it to better advantage. That element is now mainly in the hands of laymen, and to a great extent in the hands of men who either disavow or do not love religion. In their hands it is abused, it takes a tinge of infidelity, receives a character and a direction foreign to its nature. The clergy should now be instant to redeem their past neglect, to recover and accept the rejected element, to cultivate it and give it a religious direction. By so doing they will recover their influence, so far as they ought to recover it, and be again in men's minds and hearts, with power to lead them up to God.

But, in contending that the clergy should take up the social element, we would by no means have them neglect the individual element of religion. Both are elements of Christianity, and both are responded to in the deep sympathies of human nature. They should be united, carried along together, as mutual friends constantly assisting each other. We believe in no social progress, that is not demanded and sustained by individual progress. But the latter cannot reach perfection without the coöperation of the former. Therefore we advocate the progress both of humanity and of society. Nor would we have a heaven after death neglected. That is our everlasting home; it is only then that we shall be able to finish our destiny; and, in thinking more of that portion of our destiny which may be accomplished here, we would by no means think less of that which will always remain to be accomplished hereafter. O. A. B.

ART. III.—1. *The Morning and Evening Sacrifice; or, Prayers for Private Persons and Families.* Seventh Edition. Edinburgh and London: 1831.

2. *The Last Supper, or Christ's Death kept in Remembrance.* Edinburgh and London: 1828.

3. *Farewell to Time, or Last Views of Life, and Prospects of Immortality, including Devotional Exercises, a great Variety of which are in the Language of Scripture, — to be used by the Sick, or by those who minister to them.* Third Edition. Edinburgh and London: 1829.
4. *The True Plan of a Living Temple; or Man considered in his proper Relation to the Ordinary Occupations and Pursuits of Life.* In Three Volumes. Edinburgh and London: 1830.

It is not our intention to remark, particularly, on all these works. We have arranged them together at the head of this paper, for the purpose of introducing and recommending them in general terms to our readers; for, though they have been received with much approbation abroad, they are, we believe, but little known in this country.

It is the less necessary to advert with much particularity to the first three of these works, as they are pervaded by the same spirit, and are, in fact, illustrations and aids of the same general design that is more fully detailed in the last, namely, "The True Plan of a Living Temple." This contains the fullest exposition of the author's views on practical religion, and it is to this that our remarks will be principally confined. He himself remarks; — "This treatise, though the last that has appeared, is intended, however, to take place as the first of the series; — the arrangement of the different treatises, according to their objects and uses, being as follows: First, the Living Temple, as a guide to active and social duty, — next, the Morning and Evening Sacrifice for daily devotions, — then the Last Supper, for assisting those who are preparing to celebrate the most interesting solemnity of the Christian faith, — and, lastly, the Farewell to Time, for the use of those who either have the near prospect of leaving this world, or who may wish to be useful to persons in that situation."

Indeed, works which are strictly devotional in their character, or which are intended to be merely instrumental in the great work of spiritual advancement, seem to us to claim a peculiar exemption from strict critical analysis. They partake too much of the retiredness and solemnity, which belong to the intercourse of the soul with God, to be canvassed in open day, and weighed, as it were, in the scales of the market. The unconcern with which the usual public devotional services are

often regarded, and the flippancy with which they are frequently spoken of, are, to our minds, not less shocking as a matter of sentiment, than they are mournful as a moral phenomenon. It is enough for us that they answer, in any good degree, the great design they were intended to subserve. Do they give a fitting utterance to the often vague, but sincere and earnest aspirations of the soul, touched with a sense of its religious wants? Do they serve to express, and, in expressing, deepen, a sense of its religious responsibleness?

We think that the devotional works before us possess this merit in a very considerable degree. They are pervaded with a spirit of enlarged, comprehensive, and enlightened piety. They possess the great negative merits of being free from all parade and prettiness of phrase, metaphysical jargon of creeds, insincere self-humiliation, verbiage, and consecrated cant; and not unfrequently breathe forth that deep tone of sincerity, which goes directly to the heart, and to which all hearts respond. And, if these volumes be read, in the spirit in which they ought to be read, they will not need our or others' praise. After all, every thing, almost, depends on the state of the recipient mind; since the slightest word, nay an infant's sigh, that falls upon the devotionally prepared heart, may be more potent in its religious influence, than all eloquence of language; and, without this response of the religious affections, an angel's voice would be powerless, and a messenger from the dead, unheard.

With these remarks on the general character and claims of the three first-mentioned works, we take final leave of them, and now turn to the last, namely, "The True Plan of a Living Temple." This title, it is well known, has been preoccupied, and on this account it were well that some other had been substituted. But those who expect to find in this treatise any thing to remind them of the celebrated work of Howe bearing a similiar title, will be greatly disappointed. They differ in all respects; in their plan, leading principles, in the theory of religion which they severally adopt, in their whole spirit and tendency, and still more, if possible, in their style and method of illustration.

The "Living Temple" of Howe partakes largely of those unfortunate peculiarities which marked the theological literature of the excited, troubled, and, in no small degree, the

benighted age in which he lived. A popular preacher of the Court and Parliament, in the time of the Commonwealth the chaplain and personal favorite of Cromwell, he made all his learning and all his rhetoric subservient to the technical theology that then prevailed. Unlike his cotemporary Jeremy Taylor, — that writer of all times, — he did not look abroad over creation, and through the providence of God, for those analogies and coincidences, which necessarily pervade the written and unwritten revelation of the same Great Author ; — unlike him, he did not listen, with attentive ear, to the myriads of voices that are continually speaking from the heavens above and from the earth beneath, to every contemplative and devout spirit, of truth and duty ; but, like the common tribe of the theologians of his day and generation, took it for granted that all saving knowledge was summed up within the dogmas of a cramped and narrow creed, of man's device. This was, of course, fatal to all true enlargement and illumination of his mind. And when we recollect, further, that the particular creed, which thus shut out all light except that which might serve to illustrate and gild its own darkness, was essentially Calvinistic in its tenor, we shall not wonder that the writings of Howe, and the "Living Temple" among the number, find at the present day, with all but some persons of his own religious caste, a very qualified acceptance. Indeed, with any but these, the principal recommendations of his voluminous productions, will be found to consist in the occasional power and beauty of their style, and in those strong and faithful appeals to the conscience, which, though founded on erroneous and belittling views of human duty and destiny, yet bear the impress of entire honesty and solemn self-conviction, and, therefore, fall on the heart in tones of power.

We speak of these traits as occasional. And we must use this qualifying expression, since, notwithstanding the indiscriminate praise which it has become sufficiently common to lavish on the style of the leading writers of that age, it seems to us, in many respects singularly infelicitous. It is beside our present purpose to enter here into any elaborate illustration of this remark. The strictures of our author on their manner of presenting their thoughts strike us as entirely just. They seem to have had no idea of a logical division of a subject, or that there were such things as a beginning, middle, and end of it. They divided and subdivided it by a process, which

seemed to have no limit, but that imposed by the exhaustion of their ingenuity, and the failure of their power of analysis. The consequence is, that their most elaborate treatises lie before us as a mass of slightly connected fragments, and though the separate parts may present some salient points, and reflect, in their disjointed state, some prismatic hues, yet they are greatly wanting in oneness and entirety of effect.

Again, most of the theological writings of that age are essentially controversial in their character. Those of Howe, however, are a delightful exception to this remark; for though bound, as we have said, by the hard and close fetters of a technical faith, he was not, as is generally the case, so fretted and galled by them, as to impair the sweetness of his own pious nature, or make him ready to "call down fire from heaven," or bring up that from below, to consume those who honestly differed from him in opinion. He was too great and good a man, moreover, to love controversy for its own sake. But he could not, we think, claim an entire exemption from another besetting infirmity of the writers of his time. We refer to that poor parade of learning, which led them to fill up their pages, and crowd their paragraphs, with quotations and references, relevant and irrelevant, congruous and incongruous, almost without measure or end, which give them the appearance of being more ambitious of displaying their own reading than of communicating solid knowledge to their readers. They appear to have had little idea of that refined scholarship, which, like true dignity of manners, is discoverable in the general air and bearing, or indicated by indirect or unconscious allusions, rather than by an elaborate and painstaking display.

These brief remarks on the general character of the writings of Howe, apply to his treatise, the "Living Temple" which called them forth. And in all these respects, it stands opposed to the book before us bearing the same title, of which we are now to give some account.

Of the theological character of this work we scarcely know how to speak. We gather from hints scattered through the volumes, that the author, who is anonymous, is a clergyman of the Established Church of Scotland. And when we remember that the creed of this church is bristled all over with the thorniest points of the old Geneva school, we find it difficult to reconcile the fact with the prevailing religious views

of the book, which are large and liberal, and still less with its pervading tone, which is merciful and bland. There is, we apprehend, scarcely a single doctrine peculiar to the "Standards" of the author's professed faith, that is not brought into question or falsified by the positions, reasonings, and general strain of his book. We are aware that he admits in terms the doctrines of the Trinity and Atonement, but expressly says that they are not to be received "in any sectarian sense"; that they "should not be moulded into the systematic shape of doctrines, but considered as addressed to the heart and sentiments of men." He quotes very largely from the "Light of Nature," implies that he too belongs to the "family of the Searches," and apostrophizes the author, who we suppose is not considered a particularly sound Calvinist, in the line,

"Euge! tu mihi eris magnus Apollo."

He regards *David Hume* as being "by far the most accomplished metaphysician of modern times, — perhaps of any time," and considers the "Treatise of Human Nature" as the "one source" whence has flowed the "two modes of philosophizing that are at present most prevalent in the world, or that divide the philosophical world between them, — the Scotch and the German;" which we deem to be *rather* an heretical opinion. After describing "Mysticism, Ascetism, Fanaticism, Dogmatism, Superstition, and Enthusiasm," as "degenerate varieties of the religious disposition," he hesitates not to say, in so many words, that "Fenelon was a mystic, — all the monks were ascetics, — Howe had a strong tinge of the fanatic, *Calvin was the Prince of Dogmatists*, — the Romish clergy have been great patrons of superstition, and Bunyan, and Swedenborg, and Wesley, and — some others whom we don't care to mention, but who stand high in the public view, — are notorious specimens of enthusiasm." He maintains that the "origin of evil" is a phrase which has no meaning, except as embodying an abstract idea that the mind forms for its own convenience. He holds that no man is utterly worthless, but that, perhaps, good predominates even in the worst character; and he reprobates the doctrine of final reprobation. In the "Farewell to Time," he more than questions the doctrines of a "sudden conversion," and that all mankind are, either here or hereafter, to be divided into

two great classes. And, finally, in referring to certain "indications of a fanatical spirit," considers them as "exhibitions, from fact, of the miserable effects which are produced by narrow, and gloomy, and mistaken views of religion, and of this grand truth, that the only religious views which are fitted to keep pace with the order of nature and the great arrangements of society, must be of a *liberal*, and *cheerful*, and *enlightened cast*."

Now, however we may be disposed to assent to the correctness of these sentiments, we do not see how they can be honestly entertained, or consistently avowed by one, who, as a condition of being admitted to the sacred office of a Christian minister, and holding his place as such, must have formally given his assent to, and made public profession of, such articles as the following, which we copy from the constitution of the Scotch National Church.

"Do you sincerely own and believe the *whole Doctrine of the Confession of Faith*, approved by the General Assembly of this National Church, and ratified by law in the year 1699, to be the truths of God, and do you own the *whole doctrine* therein contained, as the confession of your faith?" The confession of faith here spoken of is the "Westminster Confession," together with what are called the "Larger and Shorter Catechisms," which are ordinarily bound up with it. This form of subscription is required even of the *lay* elders of the Church, and it is mournful to think that the author of the Waverley Novels, and multitudes of others, whose spirit and faith are as little Calvinistic as his own, have given in their public and solemn adhesion to it.

The author before us, in addition to the above, as a Probationer of the Scottish Church, before receiving license to preach, must have given, according to law, an affirmative answer to this question:

"Do you renounce all doctrines, tenets, or opinions whatsoever, *contrary to*, or *inconsistent with*, the said doctrine?" — that is, the Confession above mentioned.

Again: — as presentee to a recent parish, in the solemn act of ordination, in the face of the congregation, he must have assented to the following:

"Do you sincerely believe the whole doctrine contained in the Confession of Faith [that is, the Westminster Confession above spoken of] to be founded on the word of God; and do

you acknowledge the same as the confession of *your* faith; and will you *firmly* and *constantly adhere thereto*, and, to the *utmost of your power*, assert, *maintain*, and defend the same?"

"Do you *disown* all Popish, *Arian*, *Socinian*, *Arminian*, Bourignian,* and other doctrines, tenets, and opinions, whatsoever, contrary to, or *inconsistent* with, the aforesaid confession of faith?"

It is an exceedingly unwelcome task thus to note the discrepancy between the avowed sentiments and the solemn and publicly professed faith of an author, in other respects so consistent and right-minded as the one now before us. We are aware, too, that it is the legitimate result, if not the necessary consequence, of the system which requires this imposition of creeds and formularies of faith. They are, and must, in the nature of things, often prove to be snares to the consciences of good men, while they do nothing to secure the purity of the church against the access of the unscrupulous. We are aware too of the extremely loose morality which prevails among professed Christians on this point. The author who has called forth these remarks is kept in countenance, at least to a great degree, in thus solemnly professing what he does not believe, either in letter or spirit, by such men as his countrymen Robertson, Blair, and the great body of the liberal party of the clergy of Scotland, whose opinions, it is well known, lean strongly towards Arminianism. He is kept in countenance too in this by great numbers in England, on the continent, in our own country, including professors of our Theological Institutions, and in all other places, where these creeds and confessions are imposed. But the commonness of the sin only renders it a more fitting subject of reprobation. We know, too, with what cunning pretences and ingenious glosses men endeavour to excuse to themselves this tampering with their solemn protestation; — how they talk of "signing for

---

* It is somewhat singular that Antoinette Bourignon, should have found more proselytes in Scotland than anywhere else. One reason may be, that in many respects, as, for example, in her views of the freedom of the will, the doctrine of election, the unchangeable love of God, the forms of worship and formularies of faith, her opinions were vastly more rational and Scriptural, than those imposed by the National Church.

substance," and of "articles of peace," and of "not being able to keep a conscience." But all this is a poor mockery. Does not every child, in any of the lower classes of a Sunday School, know, that assenting to a creed, either by word or act, directly or indirectly, is assenting to the import and meaning of that creed; and that this import and meaning are that, and nothing else or less than that, which its language plainly expresses, and which it is understood to express by all parties concerned? And if a man assent to this with any mental reservation whatsoever, does he not thereby, and to the same extent he does so, falsify his settled convictions and act a deceiver's part? Is it not a deception moreover, and a voluntary one too, in regard to the most sacred of all subjects? But what is meant by "signing for substance?" "substance" of what? substance of the creed? that is, as we have said, what the creed is understood and known to mean? — or is it the "substance" of something that is neither understood or known in the signer's mind, or something that is known or understood to be very different from the plain import of the creed? And as to signing creeds, as "articles of peace"; is it not a plain matter of history that these very creeds and confessions of faith have, again and again, proved to be nothing but sources of alienation, war, and bloodshed? And then, again, as to "not being able to keep a conscience;" we should like to be informed, what a Christian man *can* afford to keep if he cannot keep this? — Is it his place? his pulpit? his professorship? his standing in society? And if so, shall he be permitted to keep them by a subterfuge in religious matters, which if perpetrated in the common business of life, would jeopard his character for common honesty?

But, abominating as we do every thing even approaching to indirectness in the concerns of religion, we are yet willing to believe that there are cases, where this disingenuousness, to give it no harsher name, may be nothing more reprehensible than one of that numberless class of deceptions which men practise on themselves. It may, sometimes, be a species of unconscious compromise which a well-intentioned mind makes with a bad faith, between what it thinks it *must*, but knows not *how* to believe; — between a form of faith, hallowed it may be with all the ineffaceable associations of our early homes, and a questioning state of mind, dissatisfied with itself, and verging onward towards a brighter light and manlier self-avowal. We

all know, too, or may, or ought to know how difficult a thing it is to the best of us, "to read our own consciousness without mistakes," and to give to even a rational faith, a living, forming, realizing power. But still, after making every charitable allowance for thus professing one thing and believing another, we must think, as we have said, that there is a strange apathy prevailing even in good men's minds in respect to this sin, and it is quite time, therefore, in regard to this, as Coleridge says on another point, that the "word *duty*" were sounded "in the ears of this generation."

But in reference to the author before us, however difficult it may be to reconcile the pervading tenor of his book, with his adherence to the Established Church of Scotland, with her forms and articles, we would not only gladly acquit him of all suspicion of disingenuousness, but are happy in commending, as worthy of all praise, the largeness and comprehensiveness of his views, his enlightened piety, and the open, free, benignant, and truly catholic spirit with which they are laid before us. To whatsoever sect he may belong by profession or by subscription, in all these respects we claim him as our own. And we welcome these volumes, and the favorable reception they have met with in their own country, as auspicious tokens, that the creed, which Knox transplanted from Geneva to the sterner soil of Scotland, and which the Covenanters watered with tears and blood, and which was afterwards, by public authority, fenced round with the Westminster Confession of Faith, is undergoing a meliorating process, and that from the combined influences of a better nurture, a kindlier exposure, and a more genial warmth and light, its fruits are losing their native acerbity and bitterness, and becoming, at once more palatable and more nutritive.

The object of the work before us is thus stated in the words of the author;

"As, therefore, in the Author's former treatises, it was his object to give a just direction to the *devotional feelings* of men, — and to found these upon *natural* and *human affections*, — so in the present, it has been his endeavour, by adherence to the same general plan, to give a corresponding character to the moral and religious ambition of mankind; — in the favorite words of the Saviour, — to bring 'the kingdom of Heaven upon earth;' and to teach religious men, that the serious thoughts which have been awakened in their minds, can only be really gratified,

and are only directed towards their proper objects, when they are employed, not to lift the imaginations of those who cherish them into a state of listless abstraction, or of enthusiastic rapture, — but rather, when they are so happily managed as to lead the aspirant after heaven to look with a warmer, a nobler, and a *more religious* interest on every thing on earth, — to be thankful that God has thus enabled him, by the due management of a definite trust in time, to prepare himself for a greater trust, when the kingdom of God shall be more fully disclosed, — and to believe, that it is simply by the manner in which he conducts himself amidst present interests, that his future station in the universe shall be determined." — pp. xii., xiii.

The following the author considers as the *distinctive features* of the work, subordinate to the general purpose now mentioned;

"The view which he has given of the *extent* of the Divine kingdom on earth, and of the *means* employed by Providence for the extension of that kingdom; — next, the reasonings which are submitted to the reader respecting the proper meaning and use of the term *perfection*, and of the idea which it expresses; — then, the account given of the proper nature of those services which are *more strictly religious*, and of the place occupied by our religious feelings in the general structure of human nature; — still farther, the place assigned, in the same structure, to the power which man possesses of forming notions of *ideal* excellence, and the distinction between this power, and that of aiming at what is more vaguely and commonly called *perfection;* — also, the account given of the importance of attending to *small duties*, in our attempts to make real progress in the 'way that leadeth unto life;' — and, finally, the picture of a 'good life,' with which the work is concluded, and which the Author hopes has been so managed, as at once to present a clear conception to the minds of his readers of a style of conduct which every one of them is in a condition to realize, and also to admit into this their training for immortality, the most *common* duties and interests of life." — pp. xiv., xv.

In the following account of the circumstances in which the plan of the treatise was first sketched, our readers will recognise a deep tone of sincerity and self-abandonment to his theme on the part of the author; and on these accounts, if on no other, will be predisposed to lend him a willing and candid attention.

"Of the confidence which the Author has in the truth of the principles by which the present work is characterized, and

in their subserviency to the best interests of mankind, the reader may judge from the following statement: —

"The work was sketched, its principles settled, and the whole plan of their connexion formed, at a time when the Author had little expectation that he was again to be permitted to take an active part in that living scene, the duties of which he has endeavoured to describe, — and when, with no view certainly of literary distinction, nor any care about literary honors, — but with an earnest desire to ascertain the duty actually assigned to man on earth, he busied himself, — with that deep anxiety which is known only to those who believe themselves to be bidding 'farewell to time,' — in endeavouring to find out what is the object really proposed to man as a subject of the kingdom of God, and how far he himself had succeeded in acting conformably to that object.

"No length of days can ever efface from his mind the remembrance of that bright summer noon, — made more bright and infinitely more affecting by the thought, that such brightness might be seen but for a little, — when, being incapable of more active exertion, he sketched with his pencil, in the open air, and amidst the blossoms and overshading foliage of that 'cottage garden' which had been dear to him from infancy, — the whole series of views and principles which, in a more finished form, but with no alteration whatever of their original design, he now submits to the judgment of the public; — indeed all subsequent reflection and investigation have but served more deeply to impress him with the conviction that these principles are in strict agreement with the order of Nature, and with the arrangements of Providence; — and he has, accordingly, only to add, that, having made this statement, he cannot doubt, the reader will give him entire credit, when he declares, that he now offers the work to the public with the solemn belief, that the principles which it contains are in accordance with the purest truth, — and that their adoption, as rules of conduct, would indeed make man 'a Living Temple,' — or, to use the fine words of the Divine Teacher, would bring 'the kingdom of Heaven upon earth.'" — pp. xxv. – xxvii.

It will at once be seen, from this sketch of the "distinctive features" of the work before us, that it will be impossible to bring them into view, even in an outline, within the limits allowed to this article. These "features," however, are all more or less palpable manifestations of a few first principles; and these in connexion with the general "plan" of the treatise, we shall attempt to lay before the reader, with such

illustrative remarks of our own, as, from their relative importance, or from any other cause, they may seem to demand.

But we are embarrassed with a difficulty of a peculiar kind, even at the very outset, which constitutes, so far as manner is concerned, one of the principal objections to the book. It is the diffuseness and dilution, both of thought and expression, that pervade it. The leading object and plan of the author are plainly enough, and quite often enough, brought into view, and there is, we believe, no real deficiency in oneness and logical completeness in the system, as it existed in the mind of the author; but there is a want of distinctness and prominence, both in the elementary principles, and in their connexion with each other, and with the final result, as laid down in his three volumes. We are reminded by contrast, oftener than we could wish, of that old and excellent rule of all good writing,

"Denique sit quidvis simplex duntaxat et unum."

And this, however singular it may seem, arises from excessive efforts to make himself understood. Instead of exposing himself to the difficulty spoken of by Horace, that of becoming obscure by laboring to be brief, he becomes obscure by laboring to be clear. The mystery wrapped up in the sententious saying, "Never over-explain," seems always to have been a mystery to him. He appears not to have learned the import of the rule, "Do and have done," and painfully illustrates how hard the latter is to do. If we may be permitted to use the illustration, he sometimes reminds us of those much-enduring animals, who being placed on a rotary surface, for the purpose of turning machinery, are constantly struggling onward, and seem to themselves, doubtless, to be advancing at a quick pace, but, deceived by their delusive foothold, remain, all effort and no advance, much in the same spot, all the live-long day. Or, (if we may add another illustration without exposing ourselves to the fault we venture thus to indicate,) in reading these volumes we are often in the condition of those who, having embarked on shipboard under a serene sky, with a favoring breeze, with the sails all set, and the course well ascertained, may seem to be making good head-way; but find, to their deep and blank chagrin, when they come to take an observation, that a treacherous under-current has been continually carrying them back towards the point of their departure.

And now that we have hinted at one exception, which, in

our critical capacity, we have felt ourselves obliged to take, we may as well perhaps finish at once all that we have to say of the same ungracious character, that we may go on unimpeded to give some account of this, on the whole, very good and not innutritive book.

Connected with the fault just alluded to, is another of a not dissimilar kind, which attaches to the style of these volumes. This is too much amplified. The sentences are much too long and involved. They want, like the trains of thought, condensation and point. They are singularly deficient in what rhetoricians call a *periodic* structure; that is, they do not terminate where the meaning stops; or, in other words, they are loosely put together. We arrive at what we suppose to be the end of one, and where an end is plainly indicated, and then find that we must enter on another, and so on, in long succession, until the mind becomes weary and lost in a sort of impatient bewilderment, instead of being put, as is doubtless intended, in fuller possession of the author's thought. All definite points and bearings of the prospect, intended to be opened upon the view, are merged in the gentle undulations of the surface. We are reminded, as we read, of a remark of Mr. Sydney Smith on the conversational style of Sir James Mackintosh: "Though his ideas were always clothed in beautiful language, the clothes were sometimes too long for the body, and common thoughts were dressed in better and longer apparel than they deserved." The author, as appears from his Preface, adopted this very mode of writing, partly for the sake of perspicuity, and partly that he might avoid "that false and inflated diction that has now become so common, — which has been chiefly fostered and diffused by the multitude of 'periodical works' that are at present in circulation, — but which is essentially so disgraceful to the taste of any age that favors it." Both objects are good. But we much doubt, in respect to the first, whether perspicuity is ever gained by this looseness and prolixity of style. Sentences which thus "drag their slow length along," never *tell* on the mind of the reader. On the contrary he is very liable to forget absolutely, or to retain only a sort of hazy recollection of what was said at the commencement, when he reaches their close. Thoughts when thus diluted become feeble. They are too much attenuated to reflect light. They do not in consequence, shine out like the constant stars, by their own inherent brilliancy, or ar-

range themselves like them into definite shapes, and leave a distinct image on the mind, but by being spread, like comets' tails, over a large surface, present only a dim, evanishing, and ill-remembered outline. And in respect to the other evil which the author so earnestly eschews, namely, "the false and inflated diction diffused by the multitude of 'periodical works' that are at present in circulation," this is undoubtedly one of the crying literary sins of our time; but is there no happy medium between this attempted intensity of expression and straining after effect, and a tame and wearisome, however decorous and dignified, dilation and prolixity of style?

There is a less objection than this, which we shall just advert to in passing; and this is, an extremely redundant use of certain *pet* expressions of the author; such as, "fine," "luminous," "opened," "opening up," "fragmentary," and "fragmented," which occur *passim* throughout the volumes. This, though of not much importance, except as it shows a negligence on the part of the writer, and consequently the want of a proper respect for his readers, had been better avoided.

And may we gently hint another objection which has been forced upon our notice? We mean the *rather* over complacent estimate, which the author himself appears to have of the author. He thus considers and speaks of many of the leading principles of his books as "original," and as needing in consequence to be presented in much detail, and with reiterated repetition. Thus in his preface he says, (p. xvi.) "he had important principles to make familiar, — almost to *introduce*, — to his readers." Again, (at the commencement of the second volume,) he observes, certain speculations of his "will probably be found to have awakened an *entirely new* train of thought in the minds of most of those who have submitted to the study of it." And, (in the same volume, p. 110,) he hopes "to present views as *novel*, but at the same time as *instructive* and *pleasing* as in the two former parts." Now, however "novel" these views may be to his readers within the pale of the Scottish church, we can assure him, that most of them will be recognised, as familiar and long-known acquaintances, by those who are in the habit of attending the churches, or reading the practical ethics, of liberal Christians on this side of the water. Besides, why not leave to his hearers to find out for themselves whether his "views" were "novel," "instructive," and "pleasing"? But this trait shows forth more vividly among the notes, appended to the third volume; the very insertion of most

of which betrays the want of proper deference to other minds above spoken of, being apparently mere undigested transcripts from his commonplace book. We quote in illustration of our meaning from the note marked SS., entitled "Queries proposed to the author by himself." After reminding the reader (lest he should mistake on this point!), that "they have nothing in common with those which are appended to the immortal work of Newton on light, inasmuch as they are not of doubtful solution, and to which he thinks himself in a condition to give a catagorical answer, and after remarking that he is peculiarly free from being actuated by a desire of the applause of men, he goes on to observe: "Nature has fitted my mind, not so much for *opening up* new views, as for finding out, amidst the mixed alloy, the pure and valuable metal; and long practice in this art has given me considerable proficiency in it." And immediately subjoins his own estimate of this peculiar gift of his: "In my opinion, the *rarest* and *most valuable*, though not the showiest of all talents, is that which [thus] enables a man to seize the pure gold amidst all its alloys." Can we well avoid here the "windy suspiration of *un*forced breath,"—*Ohe! jam satis est!* Now, while we are fully aware that "many a gem of purest ray serene" is kept from the light that is necessary to reveal and manifest its beauties, by a want of proper self-opinion in its owner; and know also, that self-trust and a comfortable self-complacency, not to say self-conceit, constitute the very inspiration of many not ineloquent voices, that might otherwise have remained "mute and inglorious"; still we cannot but think, that it is well to keep up the appearance of diffidence, at least, in this brassy age, and, were it only for the effect of contrast, to "assume the virtue, if we have it not." We have thus felt constrained to hint at these imperfections of the book because we wish to give an accurate idea of it to our readers. But now "*Paulò majora canamus.*" And it is with great pleasure we proceed to lay before them what seem to us to be its leading principles, which are essentially true, and extremely important both to the happiness and improvement of man.

The seminal principle out of which most of all that is peculiar to the author before us is evolved, is his idea of the Divine kingdom, or that "kingdom of God" which it was the great design of the Founder of Christianity more fully to make known and establish among men, and for the extension of which he taught his disciples to pray, to toil, and to suffer.

As the idea of this kingdom is distinctive of this essay, so in its developement as therein given, it is grand, comprehensive, beautiful, and just. It is not so original, as we have already hinted, as the author seems to suppose, but we can point to no other book where it is so fully stated, so successfully carried out into its minute details, or so closely brought into contact with active life, in its various aspects. Our first object, therefore, will be to present as accurate a sketch of it as our limits may allow.

The author rejects the common notion, that this "kingdom of heaven" is a portion of the empire of God, from which all imperfection and defect are excluded; a spiritual state or condition in which only beings of spotless excellence and consummate felicity are found; while "earth is but an outcast department of the entire scheme of things, in which vice and misery exercise a paramount control." On the contrary, this "kingdom," in his view, is not entirely excluded from any portion of the universe where the principles of order or goodness hold even a divided sway; and, therefore, opportunity is still left, even amidst the darkness and apparent misrule of this present state of things, for the prevalence of purer principles, and finer knowledge, and more unmingled enjoyment; and it was the purpose of Christ, as the messenger of God for the moral regeneration of the human race, to give to all these blessings a wider range, and a more perfect operation upon the establishments of men, and thus to establish the kingdom of God in the hearts and minds and lives of his children here on the earth. In a word, as we understand the author, (for it is difficult to find such a simple, clear, strong, condensed, and yet accurately defined statement, as might be quoted as an illustration of his own views in his own language,) by the "kingdom of God" is meant a moral kingdom; a spiritual kingdom; the reign of righteousness; the sway of kind, and pure, and holy affections; the rule of just, and true, and high principles; the supremacy of elevated and ennobling sentiments; the ascendency of the religious principles of our natures, which are of God, and lead to God, and make us partakers of the divine nature.

It is evident from this definition of the "kingdom" which Christ came to advance, that it is limited to no place, to no particular community of men, and to no definitely marked period of time. Consisting, as it essentially does, of a series of means to purify and ennoble the human soul, it is

adapted to all regions, to all the different families of the human race, to every successive age, throughout all time. It comprehends every thing in nature around us; the material world; the events of life; the peculiar circumstances of men; the private conflicts, trials, hopes, fears, and aspirations of our own spirits; all the directly religious acts and exercises of the soul; every thing, in short, that has a tendency to improve, in any way, the wide extent of the dominion of God, "as well as that higher order of occurrences, and more rare interposition of expedients, by means of which the interests of the moral and spiritual nature of man are carried forward."

This kingdom, being thus universal, is also one and the same. It consists not of various distinct and definitely marked divisions or jurisdictions. "If we could stretch our view over the whole order of things, we should perceive not separate compartments, governed by separate laws, and tending to different results, but one vast scheme, all the parts of which are in intimate and harmonious connexion. Nature, and providence, and grace, would then assume the aspect of one unbroken plan, all the portions and connexions of which, have a mutual influence upon each other." Indeed this universality of the divine kingdom in the sense explained, taken in connexion with this unity and harmony of all its separate parts, lies at the basis of all the author's reasonings in the treatise before us.

The means, it is obvious, by which this "kingdom" is advanced, are as vast and various as are all the different aspects under which it can be viewed. And the extent to which the author carries this thought will appear from the remark, that "every improvement, even on the face of material nature, is as real, though it may be not so important or influential an improvement of 'the kingdom of God,' as any amelioration of the condition or feelings of living and religious agents." In the same manner, and for a more obvious reason, all the Arts and Sciences, all political and civil Institutions by which the condition of life is improved; all that frees men from the Thraldom of his Passions and Vices; pure, refined, and liberal Tastes; the progressive Experience of life; the Maxims of the Wise; the Labors of the Good; one's own Introspective Search; Observation of Others; the Lessons of the Past; these, as well as Religious Acts, and those extraordinary and

miraculous Dispensations which are directly spiritual in their scope and aim; every means, in short, by which knowledge and virtue, and order, and good hope are promoted, and the general condition of human nature is improved, are to be considered as promotive of the "kingdom of God," in the soul of man.

Having thus established and developed, at great length, this leading thought of his essay, the author proceeds to remark on the "Relative Powers and Conditions of Individuals in this kingdom of God upon earth." As this kingdom is confined to no place or time, so all nations, and all individuals, of whom nations are composed, even the humblest and meanest, even in the most obscure and trifling act, are conspiring, whether they are aware of it or not, to carry it forward. There is a difference of *Condition* and of *Function*, but no difference in *Inherent Duties*, and *Privileges*. There is no favoritism in the dealings of Divine Providence in this respect. And as all are necessary to each, and each to all, as all are made 'members one of another' by common wants, sympathies, social connexions, pursuits, objects, hopes, and fears, all and each are conspiring, even where they seem to be most engrossed with their own selfish and apparently separate interests, to advance the great purposes of the "kingdom of God" on the earth. We commend the whole of this section as suggestive of wholesome counsels to any, who may seem to themselves to be exempted from this great bond of mutual dependence by the accidents, so to speak, of rank, station, or wealth. Those, too, who are impatient of an humble or obscure lot in life, will find themselves taught, by the same train of remark, that they are as important "members" of the same great "body," as those who act more fully in the world's eye; that the humblest act of the humblest individual may be as important in its connexions and results, as any which are chronicled in a nation's annals; and "that there is no station so low, in which a mind sincerely bent on doing good, may not find opportunities of gratifying itself to the utmost of its virtuous ambition." And the discontented of all conditions may find some light flashed in upon their consciousness by the following remark. "In truth, we are commonly much more under the influence of vanity or selfishness, than of a sincere desire to be extensively useful, when we are actuated, at any time, by an intense desire to leave the station in which Providence has placed us."

Life, and the condition of life, with all its opportunities, powers, and capabilities, regarded as a portion of the kingdom of God, are next considered by our author as a *Trust*; not as a Gift merely, to be gratefully received; not only as a blessing to be innocently enjoyed; but as a Trust, for the use of which we shall be held responsible to Him who has put it at our disposal. This truth, familiar as it is, needs to be continually enforced; for, though one of the first that is suggested to the mind, it is one of the very last that works itself into men's practice. It is peculiarly proper to be introduced into a treatise on practical religion, like that before us. Perhaps few are sufficiently aware how deeply a sense of Responsibleness is inwrought into the very nature of man; and fewer still of the extent of its application, and the solemnity of its import. It is a very superficial view of the Trust committed to us, to consider it as arbitrarily created by the religion we profess. It is indeed recognised, sanctioned, and enforced, and with an unearthly emphasis, by the great teacher of this religion. If he had left nothing on record but the "Parable of the Talents," we should have his whole mind on this subject. But it is also written on the soul; and we shall easily read it there, if we will only pause for a moment amidst our outward calls, and look in upon ourselves. Does not a capacity for improvableness enter as an essential element into all our faculties and powers of every kind? Does not the word *duty*, or its equivalent, belong to all languages, and does it not find a response in all bosoms? Does not every man, who thinks soberly on the subject, feel that the mere preservation of the talent committed, whatever it may be, is only a species of unprofitableness? Is it one? Is it small? Think not, on either account, to bury it with impunity in the earth. However insignificant it may appear, it was deemed important enough by the Divine Disposer, to be intrusted to our keeping, and even the humblest, as the history of time is continually showing, may be the remote or proximate cause, or indispensable medium, of great results. At any rate, one thing is clear. However small our Trust may seem to be in comparison with others, it is yet *every thing to us.* If well improved, the object of life is secured; if lost, all is lost. How solemn a thing it is, then, to live, to be! If to the humblest of us can be fitly applied the, for once, simple and touching lines of Johnson, on poor Levet, it will be enough:—

"His virtues walked their narrow round,
Nor made a pause, nor left a void;
And sure the Eternal Master found
His single talent well employed."

The next general remark of our author on that portion of the "kingdom of God" which is displayed in this present world, is that it might be expected beforehand to exhibit, and does in fact exhibit, "Peculiar Aspects." And the first of these presented is, human life considered as an apparently mixed, incongruous, and unfinished scheme. Perhaps no thought is oftener pressed upon all minds of ordinary seriousness than this, by the whole condition of this present existence. The inherent endowments, capacities, and aspirations of the human soul, which can find no answering developement on earth; the thirst for happiness which all present enjoyments leave unsupplied; the essential unsatisfactoriness of all aims, objects, and pursuits merely temporal; the ever-unfolding revelations of truth, and the ever-onward call of duty; the strange and deplorable confusion of events, viewed in themselves alone; the blighting of pure and well-placed affections by death, or by the sadder visitation of unworthiness; the sickness, suffering, decrepitude, poverty, and frequent friendlessness of the young, the innocent, and the good; the utter, obdurate, and continually indurating selfishness, that a long course of prosperity is liable to create; the disappointment of worthy efforts; the apparently capricious bestowments of the gifts of fortune, as they are called; the temporary success of sleek and smooth hypocrisy; the immediate triumphs of daring, open, and all but avowed villany; — these, not to extend the melancholy catalogue, are evidence enough, that the present life is not a complete and finished scheme. Every aspect of our earthly condition, taken in connexion with all that we believe of God as the moral Governor of man, shows that it is not, that it cannot be. We must deny the existence of any such being; we must blot out of our minds every cherished trace of his moral attributes, every idea of his sovereignty and providence, before we can admit, for an instant, that the present life is the whole of life to man. But if we regard it, not as being such, complete in itself, but simply as a part, and an extremely small part, of the vast dominion of God, these seeming incongruities, this appearance of incompleteness, irregularity, and disorder vanish. They are then seen to be phenomena, that beforehand might

naturally have been anticipated. For every thing, in contemplating the condition and prospects of men, as our author justly observes, depends on the point of view in which we place ourselves. As, in looking upon any natural landscape from a low point of sight, objects appear to be scattered almost promiscuously in the distance, their relative magnitudes confused, a near horizon settling down upon the whole, and a scene, not unlovely it may be, but certainly without plan or order, is presented; while, if we look at the same prospect from a higher point of view, all that seemed before confused and out of place assumes a better regularity, and objects take their proper magnitude and true proportion; — so it is with the moral aspects of life. If we confine our view to those narrow limits that are just around us, and are terminated by the grave; if we look upon this mortal existence, so to speak, upon its own dead and dreary level, it presents a spectacle of imperfection, irregularity, and disorder; and the condition and destiny of men exhibit, not only a melancholy and disheartening scene of confusion, but a sad and inexplicable enigma. But, if we view life from a higher elevation than earth and time afford; if we regard it as we may suppose it is regarded by higher intelligences; if we view it, in any humble measure, as we may suppose it is viewed by God, that is, as a part of his universal kingdom, which is from everlasting to everlasting, which comprehends all space, all beings, in all circumstances, in all worlds; then seeming incongruities vanish away; then heavenly light is thrown in upon the gloomiest spots of our earthly pilgrimage; then even the "dark valley of the shadow of death" is illumined by rays of glory beaming from the "eternal city"; and man, earth, time, and all events, appear but as parts of one grand, beautiful, admirably adjusted, and perfect whole.

There are other aspects of life, considered as a part of the same Divine kingdom, presented by our author, to which we can only cursorily refer. Thus, it is plainly a part of the plan of Providence which is presented to our view, to "bring good out of evil." Not only would the whole scheme appear perfect if it were viewed in its whole extent, but even what seems to be evil, in that part of it with which we are conversant, is seen, in many cases, to be a means of effecting a higher good than could be produced without it. And, as this is the fact in by far the greater number of examples in that part of the great

scheme which we *do* see, so it is fair to presume that the same rule holds on, and with more manifest and beautiful developements, in that part of the scheme which we do *not* see. Thus, for example, physical and moral evil, or the evil of suffering and the evil of sin, are frequently found to possess a recuperative and regenerating power, and in this way another gracious effluence of light is thrown in upon the present condition of man, considered as a member of the universal kingdom of God.

Again, that part of the great scheme, which is presented to our view, exhibits man to us in all places and under all circumstances, as laden with a *sentiment of guilt;* and at the same time it is so ordered, as to suggest to him the expectation of pardon upon true repentance, and continually to remind him that there is help and hope with God, if he will yet turn to him and live. The author very justly observes, "that perhaps the most characteristic and interesting of all the aspects, under which that portion of the kingdom of God which is manifested on earth presents itself to our view, is that of its being 'a kingdom of *Grace*,' that is, of mercy and pardon offered to a race of beings, whose minds are impressed with an indelible feeling of guilt, but who are also instructed by all just reflection on their own nature, and by all the arrangements amidst which they are placed, that the Being who formed them is full of pity for their infirmities, and that, viewing them with the forgiving eye of a father, he is anxious to aid them in all their attempts to act more conformably to their characters as his children." The wonderful coincidence of the Saviour's mission with these essential traits of human souls, and of the human condition, is very properly pointed out by the author in the same train of remark. It is, indeed, one of those many responses of the soul to the outward calls of the Gospel, which speak of the same divine original; to which thoughtful spirits are listening, more and more, all the world over; and which are gaining continually a new interest, and mutual authentication, in the same degree as we separate the pure and true words of Christ from human noises, and more faithfully interrogate and accurately note the promptings of our own consciousness.

Other aspects of life, thus considered as a part of the kingdom of God, are presented in detail, as for example, that it is a "state of continual change"; that it has a "dark as well as a bright

side," since God, in the necessary connexion between sin and suffering, shows himself a fearful avenger of evil; that no action in the moral, any more than in the natural, world is or can be insulated, or cut off from its connexions with its precedents and consequences; that these consequences of our actions invariably correspond in character with their parent source; that, whether good or ill, they spread indefinitely around us, — and are not checked or removed during this present life, but follow us into eternity. These, indeed, are all momentous topics, and, as treated by our author, can scarcely fail to suggest affecting and useful trains of thought; and with this remark we must dismiss them, that we may take up the remaining parts of the "plan" before us.

Having thus ascertained the "characteristic and luminous idea, which lies at the foundation of all our Saviour's practical views," namely, the establishment of that "kingdom of God" on earth, of which we have spoken so much at large, the next leading inquiry is, — What is the Object proposed to man, as the subject of this kingdom? We must be permitted to condense our author's reply to this question, as it seems to us, notwithstanding the value he seems to attach to the disquisition, to be much more elaborate and wire-drawn than is necessary, occupying, with its recapitulations and its affiliated topics, the whole of the concluding third part of the first volume. The answer to the question, what Object, that is, what aim or end is proposed to man, as a subject of the divine kingdom, is not, as is commonly said, *perfection*, in any absolute sense of the term, since this is necessarily a point to which he can never attain. But it is the unceasing *perfecting* of his nature. Simple as this distinction may seem to be, it is one that has been strangely overlooked. No term, perhaps, is in more frequent use with writers on morals and religion than that of "perfection," and there is none which is more meaningless, or at least more vague and fluctuating in its signification, so far as it may be said to have any. In an absolute and positive sense, man has not, and from his limited powers obviously cannot have, any idea of it whatsoever. As applied to God, for example, the only perfect Being, in this sense, we are all obliged to exclaim with the Psalmist, "Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it." And the term, considered as standing for any ideal excellence, must obviously

vary with every different individual, and in the same individual with every different degree of his advancement. But, in the use which is commonly made of this term, this vagueness and indefiniteness are lost sight of, and it is considered as indicating something fixed and absolute, and is regarded as an ultimate end, which it is every man's duty to attain. Hence the confusion, both in thought and practice, that prevails on this point. But the perfecting of our natures, "forgetting the things which are behind, and pressing forward to those which are before," aiming and striving constantly after an excellence not yet obtained, regarding every advance really made but as a vantage ground for a still onward movement, progress, improvement, untiring, unceasing advancement, in one word, perfecting, making more and better all that we have, or are, or can do, — this is an end which *can* be understood, and the only "perfection" to which man is capable of attaining. It is a relative excellence, and not a possible and final acquisition. But what, meanwhile, is the Actual Duty, in the performance of which this desire of continual improvement is to be realized? This is the question at issue. Does this duty consist in abstraction from the world, more or less entire, more or less indolent, in dreamy meditation and wrapt musings about self-sacrifice, self-renunciation, and communion with God, and growing likeness to the divine nature? No; it is no play with moonshine like this. But it is the real, active performance of the real, actual offices belonging to that condition of life, in which, in the providence of God, we find ourselves placed. This is the especial trust that is committed to every individual man's stewardship. This is the particular furrow in the husbandry of human life, that it is made each man's duty to till. It is here, and here only, he can be rendered an effective, and useful, and loyal subject of the divine government. Every man by this precise sphere of duty, thus marked out for him, is distinguished from every other man who lives; and it is by faithfulness in this particular trust thus definitely assigned to him, in contradistinction to all the myriads of men of all times and of all places, that the ultimate purposes of the universal kingdom of God are, so far as his agency is concerned, to be advanced. He is to remember, however, several essential circumstances and considerations in the performance of this particular duty. Such, for example, as these: — that life is an ever onward-flowing stream, and that it depends, in consequence,

upon our conduct at every passing moment, whether or not we enter at an advantage on that which succeeds; since there is no refluent wave, which will bear us backward to live over again lost time, and to redeem lost opportunities: and that hence results the obligation of watchfulness, prudence, foresight: — that, while each man's duty is thus definitely marked out by his condition, it insulates him from none, but makes him a colaborer with all; and that hence result the virtues of social, civil, and domestic life: — that it is very often a scene of suffering, as well as of active effort; and that hence result the passive virtues of patience, fortitude, resignation, of cheerful acquiescence and of good hope in the providence of God: — and that, finally, man is not simply a corporeal and sentient being, but a spiritual, a moral, an intellectual being, above all, he is essentially, distinctly, and characteristically, and preëminently a religious being; and has connexions, in consequence, which he can neither cast off nor sever, with a higher and invisible order of things; and hence it becomes his duty, at all times, and in the humblest offices of his present condition, to act with reference to these high and ultimate connexions, in the full and cordial exercise of faith, and hope, and heavenly-mindedness. It is, moreover, further to be noted, that these duties are not to be performed, and these virtues exhibited, in a cold, constrained, or merely perfunctory manner; but with those *dispositions of the soul*, which are necessary to give to them strong vitality, and the most fitting and graceful developement. These, thus carried into their appropriate expression in the life and conduct, are commonly called the "*Graces*" of the divine life. They are not, as they are commonly considered, "separate existences," but those "permanent expressions of sentiment and feeling with which external conduct is invested," and which give to it its life, and its beauty, and its charm. And, in the beautiful language of our author, "as they spring from the exercise of the highest and noblest of our powers, — those sentimental and prophetic powers which ally us most immediately with that invisible and mysterious world, of which all exteral things are but the visible signs, — they hence seem, wherever they reside in active energy, to give to the human character an expression of dignity almost above that of ordinary mortality, and to approximate it to the spiritual excellence of those subjects of God who have always "delighted to do his pleasure." We

commend the whole of this part of the work to our readers, as furnishing a favorable specimen of the author's powers of analysis and statement. It affords a very good example, also, of that exceedingly common, though little suspected, fallacy in all disquisitions of this kind, by which men mistake those *abstractions* and *generalizations*, which it is convenient or necessary for the mind to make and clothe in words for purposes of intercommunication, for real, substantial things. Thus what are called the "virtues" or "graces" are often spoken of as if they had a separate existence, and were not merely dispositions of the soul carried out into their appropriate manifestation. By a similar use of language, it is common to speak of man as a civil, social, moral, or religious being. What volumes of mysticism have been dreamed about an "interior and exterior life," "faith and works," the "internal and external man." But this distinction is entirely arbitrary. It is one of man's making for convenience of language. It is, moreover, altogether verbal. We have no objection to it, when this is understood. It is convenient, proper enough, and indeed necessary for purposes of minute accuracy, in moral disquisitions. But still it should always be kept in mind, that no man exists or can exist in a divided or fragmentary state, now in one portion of himself, and now in another portion of himself, or can commission these different portions to do, or forbear to do, certain things. But what a man does, is the act of the man, and of the whole man, and, the act being his, it must take its character from the motive which prompted the act. Is not this extremely plain? Why then will men, sensible and farsighted enough in common affairs, overlook this palpable fact? And why especially will moral writers, highly judicious in other respects, permit themselves to be deluded with merely verbal distinctions here? And, until we learn to keep this simple statement clearly and constantly in view, all our discourses about man and duty will be limited, embarrassed, and confused. Take, for example, the virtues or "graces" of faith, hope, and love, or any other of the lovely sisterhood; they are not, as, judging from the common language in respect to them, we might suppose, distinct and substantial existences; they are not qualities which can be superinduced upon a man's soul, laid upon or taken off from his character; but they are "*modes of conduct*," or "*styles of acting*," of the man himself, considered as one being, feeling and acting in a certain

definite way. It is one great merit of the volumes before us, that this fact is kept constantly in view, and they would be well worth studying on this account alone.

There is yet another important consideration, which must not be neglected when we say that it is the object of man, regarded as a subject of this "kingdom of God," to fulfil, faithfully and well, all the duties, little as well as great, of the place and station, in which, in the scheme of Providence, he finds himself placed. These duties, as has been already said, are to be done with all his powers and capabilities, with his entire nature. Now as he is essentially, emphatically, and characteristically a *religious* being, so it is his primal duty, not, as the common mistake is, to separate this part of his nature from the rest, and act in reference to it solely, but to do all he does, and be all he is, under the full influence of *religious* principles and sentiments. He should give to them their proper place in the scheme of life; and, as their proper place is the highest, so they should always be the ascendant motives of his will, and rule with an unquestioned sway over his whole conduct.

But it is evident, that a being, thus inherently and peculiarly religious, ought, in accordance with this nature, to perform some services which are directly expressive of his religious sentiments and feelings, and of the connexion, in which these place him, with their Author and Object. What are these? What are their nature, value, and comparative place among other duties? These questions require to be answered, since it might otherwise be inferred from what has just now been said, that, provided a man fulfils the duties of his station in life, and fulfils them in a religious spirit, there is no need of any other Religious Services, and that they may, and indeed ought to be dispensed with, as idle or useless. The whole subject of those Services, commonly considered as strictly religious, is thus brought into view, and is treated by the author with great good sense, discrimination, and liberality. We must at this stage of our remarks confine ourselves to one or two suggestions, which seem to us to be particularly worthy of being noted.

It is common, even among enlightened men, and with writers of no humble name, such, for example, as the Author of the "Light of Nature" and Zollikofer, to regard these Religious Services as important and obligatory *solely* on ac-

count of the *good effects* which they are adapted to produce on those who perform them. In fewer words they are to be regarded as *means* only. This is considered, and very properly, as we think, a low and inadequate view of the subject. These "Divine or Religious Services," as they are called, are, it is true, means, and extremely valuable in reference to their effects; but this is not all that is true of them. They are proper and valuable also as direct expressions of the peculiarly high and nobly endowed nature, which we possess as religious beings; and he who neglects these services, therefore, not only neglects an important method of religious improvement, but he fails in the discharge of a duty, which, independently of all such effects, is imposed upon him by his religious nature. Though he avail himself, then, of all other means conducive to a pure and holy life, yet, if he neglect to cultivate and express, by religious exercises, his religious sentiments, he neglects to act according to the highest, sublimest, and most characteristic part of the nature God hath given him. He fails in his imperative duty as a pious man; — *he does not act as a religious being ought to act.* We commend this thought to the serious attention of our readers, and refer them to the work before us for many valuable applications of it, which our limits will not permit us to quote. We should be glad, too, to cite our author's remarks on the obligation of Public and Social worship, and his summary of the whole subject, for the especial benefit of that large and, we regret to say, increasing number of persons, in all our religious communities, who think it well enough for *society at large*, that God should be honored in Christian forms; and that, in consequence, it is expedient that churches should be built, and their doors be opened one day in seven; and that the minister, always and in all cases, whatever may betide him, should stand up in his place; but who, thinking *themselves* too good to need to be made better, and too wise to need to learn from such services, lend to them no constant, cordial, and efficient coöperation, and satisfy their consciences on this subject by excuses too frivolous to pass current in social life for a neglect of the slightest social courtesy.

There are some admirable remarks, too, as we think, "on the forms most suitable to religious services;" and they are particularly valuable as coming from an officiating minister of the Church of Scotland, to which we suppose the author particularly alludes in the following extract; and are, as we think,

equally applicable to the prevailing forms of Congregational worship among ourselves.

"Hence the services of some of these churches, having laid aside all the *ceremonial* character which in former times had gained such universal ascendency, have become remarkable for the baldness and tameness of their devotional rites, — and men seek rather to model their understandings to certain abstract modes of thought, than to awaken or elevate their devotional feelings, when they frequent the place of public worship. It ought, however, to be kept in mind, that it is chiefly as a *sentimental* being, that man is fitted for the exercises of religion, — and that hence any form of worship which has no tendency to awaken his imagination or to expand his feelings, is defective in the very purpose for which all devotional exercises have been established."

Nothing is clearer to our own minds, than that our public religious services might be greatly improved, by changing their literal, naked, bald character, for one which is more *suggestive* of devotional feelings. But we dare not venture on this subject beyond the limits of a single sentence.

Our remarks on the *third* and *fourth* Parts of the author's "Plan," we must defer to the next Number.

ART. IV. — *Scenes and Characters illustrating Christian Truth. No. V. The Backslider.* By * * *. Boston: James Munroe & Co. 1835. 18mo. pp. 144.

As the essence of Christianity consists in its influence within, as it is "there that it must live or bear no life," there is no mode by which the heart can be more deeply affected with its truths, than by living examples of their power and beauty, exhibited in human character and conduct. Next to this are such fictions as the one before us, which, by their faithful and graphic representations of human nature, affect us for the time like reality.

"The Backslider" is intended to illustrate the influence of Christianity on minds differently constituted, — particularly on the two principal characters of the story. In Anna Hope, we see its effect on a mind naturally well balanced. The mode

in which it developes and strengthens the understanding, elevates and enriches the feelings, governs without enslaving the judgment, confirms the authority of conscience, and above all imparts a moral courage and constancy, altogether higher and more effective than any which could be derived from mere human sources, (whether it be of reason, stoicism, or animal spirits,) is here naturally and beautifully set forth. The just measure, the simplicity, the reality of her virtue are revealed, as it were, not in a happy picture, but in the real specimen. In Walter, we see the good seed scattered on the thin soil; and it is the aim of the writer to show where the lack of root is, — to bring to light those secret agents which insidiously undermine the fair promise of ardent and ingenuous natures, and against which, therefore, it behoves such natures to be especially on their guard. The besetting sins of Walter's mind are vanity and the love of pleasure; and the gradual operation of these, in bringing down to the level of the worthless, a character which seemed destined, and was by the possessor himself fully believed to be destined, to overtop all around him, is finely delineated. An ardent and intellectual character, like his, is peculiarly susceptible of the inroads of skepticism; especially when it assumes the specious guise of reason, free inquiry, and universal philanthropy; and we are impressed with the responsibility, which the inquiring mind incurs, of keeping fully in view its own fallibility, and the truth of those first principles of moral and religious faith, which are indestructible and conservative elements of human nature. While we feel sure, that such a character as Anna's would stand firm amid the same temptations under which Walter's had fallen, we are not led into the erroneous conclusion that this is wholly to be ascribed to constitutional difference. We perceive that it is because Anna has *obeyed* the command to watch and pray, that the enemy finds her prepared and able to resist attack, — because she has *sought* the aid of the spirit, that its saving influences have been vouchsafed to her, — because she had less confidence in herself, and more reliance on God, than Walter had, that she too did not fall away in her hour of trial; and we are left with the conviction that this duty of self-distrust, and sense of spiritual need, were as much within the reach of Walter's mind as of Anna's, and would have saved him from the ruinous course into which he was drawn.

The story is distressing, and we have heard this mentioned as an objection to it. We should say it exhibited no small degree of dramatic power in some of its more affecting scenes, if the simplicity with which it is told, and the holy end it has in view, did not prove that no such purpose as dramatic effect was in the mind of the author. We cannot object to its melancholy, or as it has been called, "agonizing" close. In the first place, the moral required it; and in the second, it is true to nature. Such a character as Walter's, with such an education, such motives and attachments, could not give up virtue and religion, with a less severe struggle, or with consequences less distressing. We should have said, he could never have given them up under any temptations; but let him that standeth, take heed lest he fall. As we follow the steps of Walter's downward course, we see how naturally they proceeded; we see that he who relies on his own strength, who does not clearly admit, that of himself he can do nothing, can never be safe, and we lay the lesson to our hearts, humbly hoping to profit by it.

The author has not gone very deeply into the dark recesses of dissipation and infidelity. These subjects are rather slightly touched, and it may be thought that justice is not done them. A more full and able refutation of the arguments urged by infidels against Christianity would not have been out of place in this tale, although its object is to illustrate conduct rather than doctrine. We regret that something more cogent was not offered on the side of Christian belief; it is of use to bring forward such arguments in every connexion which may procure them attention. There are many persons, who desire to possess a clear understanding of the foundations of their creed, to be able to give a reason for the faith that is in them, who, nevertheless, would not be persuaded to resort for such knowledge to the perusal of a dry work on theology. But, as to the scenes of dissipation which are presumed to have so large a share in corrupting the once innocent mind of Walter, we rejoice that the author was content to indicate their location, without revealing their contamination and horrors. They are scenes which imperfect characters and the merely innocent cannot look upon without danger; and nothing saves most minds from being corrupted by the description of them, but its being poorly done. One of the greatest faults in this tale, is the coldness of Anna's character, or rather manners.

It is desirable, though somewhat difficult, to make conscientious people interesting in a book; but we do not agree with Walter when he tells Anna that she wants feeling. It is a mistake to call those persons cold, who adhere inflexibly to duty. Moral motives are as much matters of the heart as are earthly affections, and self-sacrifice and devotion like Anna's, show a strong nature, — a capacity for deep feeling. She proved by her disregard of all other claims to her affections, and by her angelic ministry at Walter's dying bed, how fervent and true was her attachment. We might notice a few minor faults; but, as faults are things easily found out, we may safely omit them here, without the danger of their being overlooked by the reader.

In placing the works of the writers of this series in the hands of the young, we must not rely too much on them. They illustrate principles in an easy, happy manner, and bring them home to minds that would never find them, unless so assisted; still more, they suggest desires for moral excellence, and give birth to resolutions and endeavours. This impulse, this first step, of such value in all progress, is to be highly prized; — but it should also be kept in view, that it is a law of our nature, that an art can only be acquired by practice, by doing frequently, what we wish to do thoroughly and without fail. Now living is an *art*, a difficult, elaborate, and most momentous art. On the correctness of our knowledge, on the completeness of our performance of this art, depend our dearest hopes for the present and the future. We may look on and see this work performed day after day, with an understanding of its principles and an admiration of its beautiful results; but we shall not possess the power to do it ourselves, unless we put our own hand to the work. As well might the most enthusiastic pupil of Canova, seating himself in his master's *studio*, have followed with his eye, and even with his whole heart, the movements of his master's fingers, noted down the thousand touches, which bring out, by degrees almost imperceptible to the beholder, the exquisite forms which bear the impress of his genius, — in the expectation of rising up a sculptor. In the great business of living wisely and virtuously in this world, those principles of our nature which prompt to action must be called into operation. The individual must not merely be placed in circumstances in which holy motives and pure desires are excited, but he must be allowed the means and opportunities of practice, by which alone he can learn how to obey and

act out these impulses with freedom, and, as it were, spontaneously.

Bishop Butler in his admirable essay on Virtue, has done perfect justice to this subject; and we would attempt nothing more than to direct attention anew to the important principle, that virtue is *doing*, not thinking only, — that it cannot be imposed, but must be *ingrained*. Good advice and, still more, good example are important aids; but they go no farther than to dispose the heart to excellence, and to throw light on the path, in which it is to be found. The individual must obtain it for himself.

Although there is no object connected with the good of society, for which greater efforts have been made in the present age, than for education, there is still a discouraging uncertainty attending it; and this every reflecting parent feels to be the case. Its objects are pretty well ascertained, at least better than they were formerly; but there is no unfailing method yet discovered, of securing them. In other words, we have no science of education, but only a vast amount of undigested data.

Science supposes such an acquaintance with the laws of nature, as will enable us to apply these laws so as to effect our own purposes. It is by a knowledge of the laws of gravity, motion, the expansive power of steam, &c., that we construct steam-boats, rail-roads, and cotton-mills. Any person who should undertake to perform such wonders of art without a knowledge of these laws, would fail; in fact, we succeed just so far as we clearly comprehend, and accurately obey them, and no farther. A mistake of a single degree in the angle of elevation at which a car may be propelled by the power of steam, would have disappointed the Worcester Rail-road Company of their profits, and the public of the great accommodation of being able to travel from Boston to Worcester and back again, twice in one day. Now the laws of our intellectual and moral nature, though they may be less easily discovered and understood than those of matter, are quite as regular, as efficient, and as inevitable in their operation. To produce any given effect on character and conduct, we must resort to them. Our power extends no farther than to ascertain these laws, and bring them to bear on the subject we design to affect. It is all lost labor to oppose them, or to try to hinder their operation. Such an attempt the merest enthusiast

would not make in his dealings with matter. Yet it is continually made in our dealings with mind; and the reason is obvious. Although, as has been said, we have many data, we have no system of moral and intellectual philosophy, which will answer the purposes of science; that is, no system, whose principles are so well established, that each one can go to it for the rule he needs, and be sure of success in its application. Whether such a science is within the limit of human powers we will not presume to decide; but, until we do obtain it, those arts which depend on the principles of man's internal constitution, the arts of government, of education, of living, of reforming the vicious, will never advance much beyond their present unsettled state, and our discoveries and acquisitions will continue to be incidental and miscellaneous, and therefore of little avail as regards the end proposed above.

There is no field in which philosophy has labored more industriously, although with such poor success, than that of the human mind. The peculiar difficulties of the subject have often been stated, and it is not necessary to repeat them here. While they help to account for past failures, they are not such as to discourage future attempts. The miscellaneous character of the efforts, which have been and are made, is probably after all one of the greatest obstacles to progress. Science is built up by the labor of successive minds, each taking up the work where its predecessor left it; no one science has been completed by a single mind. This is no new idea. Every one admits its truth; yet its force is not felt in intellectual as in physical science, as is proved by its not being acted on. No philosopher of the present day would expect to effect any thing valuable in physical science, unless he took up the subject he designed to prosecute at the precise point where those who had labored before him had arrived, availed himself of their discoveries, conformed to known laws, or obtained others hitherto unknown by a fresh induction. That this has not been done in intellectual science (the most difficult and abstruse of all), no one will deny. In this department, we have almost as many different systems as writers; and the present mode of studying metaphysics is, not to ascertain what are the facts which are known and recorded concerning man's spiritual nature, and what are the general principles established by these facts, — but what is the theory, or the opinions, of this or that philosopher.

When we reflect on the rapid progress, the achievements once not dreamed of, made in the arts of life, since men have adopted true principles, and have ceased to work in the dark, on these subjects, and when we remember, that, however varied the condition in which man is placed, he must still act in conformity to the elements and principles of his constitution, we are not yet ready to sit down with the disheartening conviction, that he will never succeed in the attempt to arrange the present multifarious mass of mental phenomena, and evolve the first principles to which they must all be referable. We believe this will be accomplished, as soon as we are content to pursue the subject by the same course of patient induction, which is recognised as the only condition of science in the material world, and without which, as has been said by Lord Brougham, a man "may be a Fancier, but cannot be a Philosopher." A conviction that this is the only true and universal method, is gaining ground. The success with which it has been applied in Paris, especially by M. Louis, to the investigation of the causes and conditions of diseases, and the light it has already thrown on the unsettled principles of the medical art, prove to what an extent order and certainty may be introduced by it into phenomena the most complicated and recondite

On this subject, however, there is reason to believe, that we have not the excuse of ignorance to so great an extent as many suppose. There are some laws of mind generally recognised and acted on; and, as far as this *is* the case, success always follows. There are others known, at least not generally denied, which are yet often neglected; and we daily witness attempts to produce effects on character and conduct wholly at variance with them, and people wonder at the failure, but are not instructed by it.

It is admitted, for instance, that what have been called the *emotive* powers, the desires, affections, &c., are the springs of action, the principles which impel and produce human conduct. And yet we often observe those, who are engaged in the formation of character by means of education or public legislation, disregard this known law of mind, and undertake to produce, by cold precept and formal ordinances, the energetic action and undivided attention which are the results of voluntary effort. How little is that single principle, the *will*, understood and appreciated. All admit, when questioned,

that it is an essential element in human conduct, — that you may as well undertake to balance a mill-stone by a feather, as to move the free agent one step without it; and yet we go on, doing and expecting, as if this were only an incidental circumstance, and not a fixed law.

It is also known that sympathy and emulation are suns to the mind, that they double its capacities, quicken its powers, and bring out fresh shoots; — yet these principles are not unfrequently disregarded by those, whose business it is to develope or employ the moral and intellectual powers of their fellow creatures. It has been found that fear is a *debasing* principle, that it chills and checks the operations of the mind, and shuts up the soul. Its use is obvious; it was given to deter us from doing what is wrong or hurtful. But this principle is sometimes applied, not to deter from, but to prompt to action, with the vain expectation of obtaining that free and fair use of the powers which only produces satisfactory results, from the application of a law whose tendency is to prevent such use. Even the trite maxim, that example is better than precept, is sinned against every day. This often comes, we are aware, from weakness and indolence. Precept is so much easier than example, that we are ready to content our consciences with the lesser sacrifice, hoping to make up in quantity, what is wanting in quality. But if we had a thorough conviction of the authority of the laws of the human mind, however weak and inefficient might be our conduct, we should not be guilty of the mistake of attempting ends unless we could bring into use the appropriate means; at least we should not attempt them by means understood to be essentially inappropriate. If our fire was going out, and a vessel of water stood by our side, while the fuel was at some distance from us, although our indolence or incapacity might prevent us from going for the fuel, we should hardly think it advisable to throw on the water, in the hope that it would revive and feed the flame. Yet conduct not less irrational may be observed every day in our intercourse with mankind.

Many more instances might be mentioned, of that disregard of known laws, in our attempts to act on mind, which would be deemed absurd in our dealings with matter. It is not our design to make a complete list of such instances, but to enforce the principle, that, since nature in all her phenomena of mind, not less than in those of matter, is subject to

regular laws, it is only in proportion as the teacher, the philanthropist, and the political reformer become acquainted with, and conform to these laws, that they can reasonably expect to accomplish their objects; and to this extent they may expect to accomplish them. Thus, if in education we observed the law, that the mind acts vigorously and does full justice to its powers only when its sympathies are alive and its desires ardent; that we do not work hard to obtain what we do not relish, comprehend, or love; that the services rendered by fear are feeble and false, those by love true and abundant; — if, in our attempt to better the condition of the poor, we kept in sight the principle that habits of industry and a regard to character are among the best securities against mendicity; — if, in our plans for moral reform, we remembered that sympathy, occupation, and the acquisition of knowledge generate purifying processes in the character, and that religion is the soul's central light and power, the basis and bond of perfectness, — even if we made no new accessions to our knowledge of the philosophy of mind, our labors would be far more frequently, than they now are, rewarded by success. But we are looking for new accessions. The impulse everywhere given to free enquiry, seems to act like the magician's wand on the face of society. "The Press," which, to borrow the words of a late writer, "has rendered the world one great whispering gallery, whose faintest echoes are distinctly heard at the farthest end," is pouring out its productions in endless variety and abundance. That grand principle, the diffusion of knowledge, is the product of our own times; there was nothing like it in antiquity. In its operation, an experiment on human nature is instituted, next to Christianity, the most momentous ever made upon the race. As knowledge is power, it is placing in the hands of the community, and of each individual that composes it, an engine mighty beyond all conception; and, if knowledge be virtue, as it ought to be, and as we trust it is to be, this accession of power is destined to swell the fountains of human felicity and improvement, to an extent, which we, who are on the outskirts of this vast movement, can but dimly discern.

ART. V. — *Meaning of the Title, "Angel of Jehovah," as used in Scripture; being in continuation of the Article on the "Deity of the Messiah not a Doctrine of the Old Testament."* *

WE resume the discussion of the question, Whether the Deity of the Messiah be a doctrine of the Old Testament. In our last article upon the subject, we examined all the passages adduced by Hengstenberg, in which the Messiah is mentioned as such, or as the future anointed one, whom God was to raise up for the deliverance of his people. The passages which remain to be examined are of a different kind. They are those, in which an angel of Jehovah is represented as having appeared to various persons, which angel is said by Hengstenberg and others to be identical both with Jehovah and with the Messiah. The discussion of the argument founded on the passages in question we regard as rendered necessary solely by the ingenuity and respectability of the learned men of the present time, who have adopted it; such as John Pye Smith, whose work on "The Scripture Testimony to the Messiah" is said to have placed him at the head of the English Dissenting theologians, and such as Hengstenberg, and the Andover theologians, who published his argument in their "Repository" without comment. We are confident that no common readers of the Bible would imagine, that the angel, who was manifested to the patriarchs and others, was Jesus Christ. We suppose that few in fact believe it. We suppose that the common faith amongst those who have not been led astray by learned ingenuity aiming to establish a theory, is, that "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, *hath in these last days spoken to us by his Son*," and not until those last days. Still, as long as such an argument is insisted on by high living authority, the "Christian Examiner" must not regard it as unworthy of an investigation.

In the passages which we propose to examine, it is not pretended that the Messiah as such is denoted, or declared to be identical with Jehovah. It is not pretended by any writer, that the doctrine of the Deity of the Messiah is extracted

* See Christian Examiner for January, 1836. Vol. XIX. p. 302.

from them, except by taking them in connexion with other parts of Scripture. From the passages themselves it is inferred by Hengstenberg, that the angel mentioned in them is identical with Jehovah; and from other passages, and other considerations, it is inferred that the same angel is identical with the Messiah or with Jesus Christ. His argument is founded on an axiom not to be met with in any edition of Euclid that we have seen, namely, Two persons, being identical with a third person, are identical with each other. Or, to put it in language less abstract; If James and John are proved to be the same being with Peter, then James is John and John is James. By virtue of this axiom, if Jehovah himself and the Messiah are both proved to be identical with the angel of Jehovah, it follows that they must be identical with each other, and that the Messiah is Almighty God.

We shall not stop to remark upon the confusion of ideas or the manifest contradictions, presented in the very statement of the doctrine which Hengstenberg undertakes to prove. We will forget, as far as practicable, the nature of the doctrine, and consider the question entirely as one of Biblical interpretation. Our inquiry shall be, What is the true exposition of the passages of Scripture above referred to, from which the Deity of the Messiah has been inferred?

The argument, as we have intimated, consists of two points, or involves two propositions; first, that the angel of Jehovah is a distinct person from Jehovah, and yet truly and essentially the same being with him; and, second, that this angel is the same being with the Messiah. Each proposition is to be proved by separate evidence. In the first place, therefore, we will consider the evidence brought to support the first. As the passages, which are supposed to contain the evidence of this proposition, resemble each other, and are all to be explained in the same way, it may be as well to place before the reader several of those, which are regarded as the most important, so that, having the facts or phenomena of the case before us, we may be able to judge, which is the true or best explanation of the difficulties which they present.

Genesis xvi. 7. — "And an angel of Jehovah found her [Hagar] by a fountain of water in the wilderness. V. 10. And the angel of Jehovah said to her, I will multiply thine offspring exceedingly, &c. V. 13. And she called the name of *Jehovah*, who spake with her, Thou art *a God* that mayest be seen. For, said

she, do I not here see the light, though I have seen God?* Wherefore the well was called the well of life, of vision."

Genesis xviii. 1. "And Jehovah appeared to him [Abraham] amid the oaks of Mamre, while he was sitting at the door of his tent in the heat of the day. And he lifted up his eyes, and looked, and lo, three men stood before him; and when he saw them, he ran from the door of his tent to meet them, and bowed himself to the ground, and said, My Lord, if I have found favor in thy sight, pass not away, I pray thee, from thy servant. V. 13. And Jehovah said to Abraham, Wherefore, &c. Is any thing too hard for Jehovah? About this time another year *will I return to thee*, and Sarah shall have a son. V. 16. And the men rose up from thence, and looked toward Sodom, and Abraham set out with them to accompany them on their way. V. 20. *And Jehovah said*, The cry concerning Sodom is great, and their sin is very gross; I will therefore go down, and see whether they have done altogether according to the cry concerning it; or if not, I will know. And the men turned their faces from thence, and went toward Sodom, but Abraham remained standing before Jehovah. And Abraham drew near and said, Wilt thou also destroy the righteous with the wicked? xix. 1. And the two angels came to Sodom at even. Vv. 12, 13. And the men said, — For we will destroy this place, because the cry concerning them has become great before Jehovah, and Jehovah hath sent us to destroy it. V. 16. And while he lingered, the men laid hold upon his hand, and upon the hand of his wife, and upon the hand of his two daughters, Jehovah having compassion upon him; and they brought him forth, and set him without the city.

V. 18. "And Lot said to them, O not so, Lord! Behold now thy servant hath found favor in thy sight, and great is the mercy thou hast shown me in saving my life. — And he said, See I have regard to thee in this thing also, that I will not overthrow this city, for which thou hast spoken. V. 24. Then Jehovah rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah fire and brimstone from Jehovah out of heaven." See also Gen. xxi. 17, 18; xxii. 1, 11 – 14.

Exodus iii. 2. "And an angel of Jehovah appeared to him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush; and he looked, and behold, the bush burned with fire, and the bush was not consumed. And Moses said, I will now turn aside and see this great sight, why the bush is not burned. And when Jehovah saw that he turned aside to see, *God* called to him out of the bush and said, &c. V. 6. Moreover he said, *I am the God of thy father*, the God of

* I have paraphrased this verse a little, to bring out what I suppose to be the meaning. The literal rendering would be, "Thou art a God of vision. For, said she, do I not here see (i. e. live) after vision?"

Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. And Moses hid his face; for he was afraid to look upon God. And Jehovah said, I have surely seen," &c.

Judges vi. 12. "And the angel of Jehovah appeared to him, and said to him, Jehovah is with thee, &c. V. 14. And Jehovah looked upon him and said, &c. V. 22. And when Gideon perceived that he was an angel of Jehovah, Gideon said, Alas! O Lord Jehovah! because I have seen an angel of Jehovah face to face."

Judges xiii. 3, 21, 22, 23. "But the angel of Jehovah did no more appear to Manoah and to his wife. Then Manoah knew that he was an angel of Jehovah. And Manoah said to his wife, We shall surely die; *for we have seen God.* But his wife said, If Jehovah had a desire to kill us, he would not have received a burnt offering," &c.

From these passages it appears, that persons, having seen an angel of Jehovah, are said to have seen God; that an angel is said to have appeared in a flame of fire in a bush, and immediately after, God is said to have called to Moses out of the bush, and to have said, "I am the God of Abraham," &c.; that in one verse, an angel of Jehovah is said to have spoken to Gideon, and in the following, "and Jehovah looked upon him and said," &c.

To account for this singular phraseology there have been three principal theories.

1. That which supposes the "angel" to denote the second person in the Trinity, i. e. a distinct person from God, and yet essentially, not nominally and virtually, the same being with God.

2. That which supposes "angel" to denote a symbol of the divine presence, or Jehovah himself manifested to the human senses by a material symbol or token, a fire, a voice, or the form of a man; that the angel was not in itself a person, and that no *personal* agent was concerned, but the Supreme Being himself.

3. That by the "angel of Jehovah" is meant one of those heavenly spirits, which are represented as standing in the presence of God to do his bidding, and bear his messages, and which, existing only to execute the will of God, intrusted with his purposes, speaking his words, and especially having his name, his divine authority, his *numen* in him, is allowed to personate the Deity.

Of these three theories, it is to be observed, that the first

implies a very important doctrine, as well as a very singular and apparently contradictory one, in regard to the divine existence. The two last imply no new doctrine relating to the divine existence, and the only question is, which explanation is best authorized by the established laws of interpretation. Not so with the first, and we object against it,

I. That it is a mere theory. The doctrine of a person, called "an angel" or "the angel of Jehovah," a person distinct from God and yet the same being with him, is nowhere taught in the Old Testament; nowhere laid down as a truth to be believed. It is not pretended, that the passages in question declare the doctrine. They relate entirely to a very different subject, and have a very different object from that of teaching the mode of the divine existence. If the passages in question imply such a doctrine, they certainly do not state it. We object, therefore, to the theory of Hengstenberg, that, if so important and so perplexing a doctrine had been true, it would somewhere in the revelation of Moses have been expressly stated; its relation to the divine unity would have been defined. The Jewish lawgiver has been very explicit in laying down the doctrine of the unity of God: "Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our God, Jehovah is one." His hearers must have understood the word *one* in the common acceptation of the word, as signifying one person, one intelligent agent, one infinite mind, one person. But, if Moses had believed such a doctrine as that which Hengstenberg supposes to be implied in the passages in question, that the Deity exists in two or more persons, one of whom is "the hidden God," and the other sent to the sons of men, we should somewhere find an express statement of the doctrine. We should find cautions given, that the doctrine might not be confounded with polytheism, or that it might not degenerate into polytheism. If the passages imply merely a singular usage of language, that usage must have been understood at the time when they were written, and then needed no explanation, however extraordinary it may appear now. But, if they imply the doctrine of two persons, each of which is God, it is impossible to account for the fact, that so extraordinary a doctrine is not laid down, stated in express terms, and its relation to the divine unity explained; especially as polytheism was the vice to which the Jews were most prone, and as the doctrine of the unity of God is the corner-stone of the Jewish dispensation. But this is not done, either in the

Pentateuch, or in the writings of any of the Jewish historians, or in any of the poets or prophets. The difficult passages themselves, or others still less satisfactory, are the only ones in the Old Testament, which are supposed even to imply it.

II. It is the opinion of Hengstenberg, that the title "son of God" expresses the highest nature of Jesus, or denotes the second person in the Trinity. But, if the second person in the Trinity be referred to in these passages, why is he not called the "son of God" in some of them at least? Why does nothing occur in these passages, or in any part of the Old Testament, to lead one to suppose that "angel of Jehovah" and "son of God" are synonymous?

III. A decisive objection against the theory of Hengstenberg is, that there is nothing in the passages in question to warrant the supposition, that one and the same angel is always intended. The word in the Hebrew is used without the article, so that our translators correctly render it, "*an* angel of Jehovah." Nothing occurs to show that any particular angel, any preëminent angel, was intended. It is as if it had been said, that one of the thousands of the angels of Jehovah, or one of the angels of his presence, one of several which use to stand before God, had appeared. The angel, too, is sent by God, and does not come without orders, or of his own accord. In the vision of Jacob's ladder, Gen. xxviii. 12, the angels of God are represented as ascending and descending, Jehovah being at the top to give commands and to receive communications. This vision no doubt implies the belief of the writer in many angels. So, chap. xxxii. 1, angels of God are said to have met Jacob. When then we read of *an* angel of Jehovah without a name or mark of preëminence we must infer that one of the many angels spoken of by the same writer is intended.

And that no particular, preëminent angel, a person distinct from God and yet the same being with him, was intended, we think is evident from the representation in chapters xviii., xix., which shows, as we think, that to each of three angels are the names and attributes applied, which are supposed to prove one to be the second person in the Trinity. In xviii. 1, it is said, "Jehovah appeared to Abraham; — behold, three men stood by him;" i. e. three angels, as we think, and as the caption of the chapter stands in the Common Version. Jehovah appeared, or was manifested, to him equally by each of the

three angels. This is the view of the case taken by the authors of the Common Version, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews,* and by most interpreters. † The supposition, that one of these men in appearance was Jehovah himself, in person, accompanied by two angels, and that he ate with Abraham, does not so well accord with Jewish opinions, or with verses 1 and 2, or with verses 20, 21; "*I will go down* now, and see whether they have done altogether according to the cry of it, which is come to me; and if not, I will know. *And the men turned their faces* from thence, and went toward Sodom." By the men are evidently meant the two angels, said in xix. 1, to have arrived at Sodom, and Jehovah goes down by these two angels. As to the fact that Abraham, in xviii. 3, uses the singular number, "*My Lord*, if I have found favor in thy sight," which is used as an argument to show that one of them was preëminent, and probably Jehovah himself, accompanied by two angels, it proves no such thing; for, in xix. 18, 19, precisely the same phraseology occurs in relation to the two angels. "And Lot said to *them*, O not so, my Lord."

In verse 21, one of the angels says, "See *I* have accepted thee concerning this thing also, that *I* will not overthrow this

---

*Hebrews xiii. 2.

†Thus D'Oyly says, in his Answer to Sir William Drummond's attack upon Revelation, (p. 40,) "You insinuate, that Christians believe the Supreme Jehovah to have actually come to Abraham in a human form, to have sate at table familiarly with him, and to have partaken of the calf which he dressed."

"Really, Sir, it is astonishing you should have hazarded such an assertion, when, at the head of the chapter, in our authorized English translation, you might have read, 'Abraham entertaineth *three angels*;' a complete proof, that, by the English readers at least, the passage is understood to speak, not of Jehovah himself appearing, but of angels or messengers commissioned by him; and almost every commentator, whom you could have consulted, would have taught you to understand it precisely in the same manner. I admit the expression runs in some parts of the narrative, as if the Lord were present in person, and spoke with Abraham.

"But you cannot be ignorant, how common a form of language it is, to say, that a person does himself what he commissions another to do. . . . . If you turn to Exod. iii. 2, you will find it expressed, the 'angel of the Lord appeared to Moses in a bush;' but the account goes on (ver. 4), '*The Lord* saw that he turned aside; *the Lord* said, I am the God of thy fathers,' &c. Here most clearly, the Lord is said to have spoken himself, when an angel appeared and spoke in his name. . . . . This passage has been always held, with very few exceptions, to treat of three angels."

city, for which thou hast spoken." Here one of the angels evidently assumes the attributes of Jehovah as much as the one, who remained with Abraham in chapter xviii.

As to verse 24, "Then Jehovah rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from Jehovah out of heaven," whether by "Jehovah" first mentioned in the verse is intended the angel representing or personating the Deity, who had just consented to spare Zoar, is uncertain. This was the opinion of Grotius, who understands by the phrase "from Jehovah" in the latter part of the verse, "by the aid of Jehovah," "potestate sibi divinitus concessâ." And it is a little remarkable that the same explanation is adopted in the book Sohar, upon which Hengstenberg relies so much, as we shall see hereafter, to prove the Deity of the angel. Commenting on "Jehovah" first mentioned in the verse, the writer says, "Hic est gradus, sive persona ex judicio inferiore, quæ accepit potestatem de supernis."*

Another opinion is that of the Arabic translator, followed by the best of Jewish critics, Aben Ezra, and by Calvin and others, who suppose the language to mean, "Jehovah rained *from himself*, &c.," which is thus ably defended by Dr. Geddes. "Nothing is more common in the Oriental languages, than to use the noun for the pronoun; and this indeed seems to be the language of nature. A child is not wont to say of himself, 'I am a good boy;' but 'Billy good boy;' or of his sister, 'Thou art a naughty girl,' but 'Sally naughty girl;' and it is with some difficulty that he is made to understand, that *I* means himself, and *thou* the person to whom he speaks. A few examples from Scripture will, I apprehend, settle this matter. Gen. ii. 3, 'God blessed the seventh day, &c., because on it he ceased from all his works, which *he* (the text has *God*) had ordained to create.' Exod. xvi. 7. 'Ye shall see the glory of the Lord, on his hearing your murmurings against *him*,' — the text has against *the Lord*. Thus Josh. ix. 21. 'Let them live,' said the chiefs, 'as the *chiefs* (i. e. *we*) have promised to them,' &c. 1 Kings ii. 19, 'Solomon caused a throne to be placed for the *king's* mother,' i. e. for *his own* mother."

It seems, then, to be indifferent to the writer, whether he says, that either of the three angels, two of whom say, "Jehovah sent

* See Schoettgen, Hor. Heb. et Tulmud., Vol. II. p. 430.

us to destroy the city," speaks, or that Jehovah speaks. "Jehovah," and "the angel" or "angels of Jehovah," are used as interchangeable terms. What either of these angels says, Jehovah says. What either of them does, Jehovah does. Jehovah was manifested and spake by all three of them, as he might in three or more prophets. It is evident, then, that the same kind of language, which has been supposed to prove an angel to be the same being with Jehovah, is here applied to three. It follows, then, that no particular angel is denoted in the passages in question. The same names and attributes may in the same way be applied to every angel or all the angels, whom Jehovah might send.

That no particular angel was intended is also manifest from Numbers xx. 16. "And when we cried unto Jehovah, he heard our voice and sent *an* angel," not any particular, preëminent angel, but simply an angel.

Hengstenberg, it is true, maintains that the language in question must always denote one particular angel. "Certainly," says he, "מַלְאַךְ אֱלֹהִים cannot be translated 'an angel of God.'" "מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה cannot possibly be translated otherwise than by '*the* angel of Jehovah.'" Such is the confidence of the man, though his assertion is in opposition, probably, to every translation of the Scriptures, that ever was made; certainly to every one, with which we are acquainted. He appeals, for his authority, to the Grammar of Ewald, §§305, 308, a work which we have not been able to examine. We shall be unwilling to believe that it contains any rule to support his assertion, until we do see it. The notion is probably the exclusive property of Hengstenberg. It amounts to this, that the Hebrew language cannot express the meaning conveyed by the terms, "*an* angel of Jehovah," without using the circumlocution, "one of the angels of Jehovah." Of course, to express the meaning "a prophet of God," it must use the circumlocution "one of the prophets of God."

The question may easily be settled by applying the rule to a few passages of scripture.

Let us apply it to Judges xiii. 6. The wife of Manoah says to him, "A man of God came to me, and his countenance was like the countenance of an angel of God." According to Henstenberg it should be, "*The* man of God came to me, and his countenance was like the countenance of

the angel of God." A rendering, which, in the connexion in which it stands, is little short of nonsense; unless it were the belief of the speaker that Jehovah had but one angel. But this will not be maintained. 1 Kings xxii. 7. "And Jehoshaphat said, Is there not here a prophet of Jehovah?" According to Hengstenberg's rule, "Is not *the* prophet of Jehovah here?" a rendering entirely inconsistent with the connexion. *

If Hengstenberg had been as anxious to ascertain the validity of his rule, as to establish the point he had in view, he would not have wondered so much, "that this rule should have been overlooked by so great a number of learned men among the moderns."

Another argument, by which Hengstenberg endeavours to prove, that not a common angel is meant, but one superior to all created angels, is drawn from the narrative in Genesis xviii., where he maintains that two of the angels fall into the background in comparison with the third. This argument we have already refuted. We add to our remarks upon that chapter, that the circumstance of Abraham's using the singular, "My Lord," in addressing the angels, appears to us to be most probably a mere idiom of the Hebrew language; the meaning being, that he applied the appellation "my Lord" to *every one* of them.† The same idiom occurs in the address of Lot to the two angels, xix. 18. This last verse shows at least, that whatever superiority one angel might appear to have over the two others, was possessed by the second over the third.‡

---

* See also 2 Kings iii. 11. 2 Chron. xviii. 6, xxviii. 9. In some instances the common version gives a wrong sense by using the definite instead of the indefinite article. Thus Gen. xiv. 18, "*the* priest of the most high God," as if there were but one in the world. Gen. xxxii. 1, "*the* angels of God," which leads to the vain inquiry, what angels?

† This explanation is mentioned by Junius. "Omnes simul appellat primùm, tanquam e longinquo; tandem singulos prensat et invitat; nisi fortè speciatim eum compellaverit, quem herum fuisse ex specie judicabat." See Poole's Synopsis, upon Gen. xviii. 3.

‡ The note of St. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, Lib. xvi. Cap. 29, as quoted in Le Clerc's Commentary on Gen. xviii. 1, is well worth transferring to our pages. It agrees in substance, though not in all particulars, with our explanation. "Deus apparuit Abrahæ ad quercum Mambræ, in tribus viris, quos dubitandum non est angelos fuisse, quamvis quidam existiment unum in eis fuisse Dominum Christum," &c. Verùm tamen si propterea confirmant horum trium aliquem fuisse

Hengstenberg says also, "Jehovah, or, as he is called in Ch. xxxi. 11, 'the angel of God,' stands on the top of the ladder, while the angels ascend and descend on the same." This is a misstatement. In chapter xxxi. 11, an angel is spoken of, who appeared in a dream to Jacob whilst he was serving Laban. That he calls himself the God of Bethel, is to be explained in the same manner as the other passages, in which "the angel" is used interchangeably with "God."

Another argument is derived from Isaiah lxiii. 9, where it is said, in the Common Version, "The angel of his presence (or face, or countenance,) saved them." But the term פָּנָיו, "his face," "his presence," is often used as a mere periphrasis of the third personal pronoun; and the verse in question will mean merely, that "*his* angel," or "an angel of God," saved them.*

One other argument Hengstenberg draws from Exodus xxxiii. 2, 3, where God threatens to leave the Israelites to the conduct of an angel, and not to go with them himself. But I find here no reference to an *inferior* angel in distinction from a superior one. A few verses preceding, xxxii. 34, Jeho-

---

Christum, quia cum tres vidisset, ad Dominum singulariter est locutus, &c.; cur non etiam illud advertunt, duos ex eis venisse, ut Sodomitæ delerentur, cum adhuc Abraham ad unum loqueretur, Dominum appellans, et intercedens ne simul justum cum impio in Sodomis perderet? illos autem duos sic suscepit Lot, ut etiam ipse, in colloquio suo cum illis, singulariter Dominum appellaret, &c.: 'Oro, *Domine*, quia invenit puer tuus misericordiam ante te,' et quæ sequuntur. Deinde post hæc verba, singulariter illi respondet Dominus, cum in *duobus* angelis esset, dicens: 'Ecce, miseratus sum faciem tuam,' &c., unde multo est credibilius, quod et Abraham in tribus et Lot in duobus viris Dominum agnoscebant, cui per singularem numerum loquebantur, etiam cum eos homines esse arbitrarentur. Neque enim aliam ob causam sic eos susceperunt, ut tanquam mortalibus et humanâ refectione indigentibus ministrarent; sed erat profecto aliquid, quo ita excellebant, licet tanquam homines, ut *in eis* esse Dominum, sicut assolet esse in prophetis, hi, qui hospitalitatem illis exhibebant, dubitare non possent. Atque ideo et ipsos aliquando pluraliter, ut Dominos; aliquando singulariter, ut *in eis Dominum*, appellabant."

* See Prov. vii. 15, and Ezek. vi. 9., where "loathe themselves" is in the original "loathe their faces." Also Stuart's Grammar, § 475. So Gesenius and De Wette understand the verse. Others, as Lowth and Eichhorn, understand the phrase to mean "an angel that stands in the presence of God"; i. e. one of the few, who were admitted into his more immediate presence, in allusion to the sentiments and customs of the kings of the East, who admitted only the most distinguished into their presence. Calvin's opinion we shall have occasion to give in another place.

vah says, "*My* angel shall go before thee," which would certainly seem to denote as high an angel as is denoted in Exodus xxiii. 20, "Behold I send *an* angel before thee," &c. It appears to me that what Jehovah threatens is, that he would withdraw his immediate presence from them, whether that presence was regarded as residing in the cloudy pillar which accompanied the angel, (compare vv. 7, 8, 9, 10,) or in the angel himself. What is added in Exodus xxiii. 21, "For my name is in him," appears to me to favor a conclusion the very reverse of that which Hengstenberg derives from it. It seems to me to show, that it was a common angel, who was to be sent by Jehovah, yet one that was to be obeyed, not simply as an angel, but because "the name of God was in him." I think it probable that "my name" means, my *numen*, my divine spirit, my presence, accompanying the angel, or dwelling in him, as it might dwell in a thousand angels at the same time, or in human beings. So in latter times the Shechinah, though regarded as perfectly distinct from the angel, was said to be with him, or in him, as also in human beings, as will be seen hereafter. This *numen*, or *presence*, may be what was threatened to be withdrawn, in ch. xxxiii. Certainly, if the meaning had been, that God would withdraw an exalted angel, who had hitherto guided the Israelites, and send an inferior one, very different language would have been used. The language is, that he himself, in contradistinction from any angel, would not go with them. He would send before them such an angel as he had formerly sent, but unaccompanied with his immediate presence, whether this presence was regarded as dwelling in the angel, or in the cloudy pillar.

If then the representation in the passages under consideration is, that merely *an* angel, one of the many angels of Jehovah, appeared, and if to any one of the thousands of angels, whom Jehovah might send, the names, attributes, and actions might by Scripture usage be applied, which are applied to the angel in those passages, then the theory of Hengstenberg is unsound.

IV. The passages in question may be satisfactorily explained as implying only a singular use of language, without supposing that the sacred historians meant to teach, by a few casual hints or intimations, a new and strange doctrine, apparently inconsistent with the fundamental doctrine of Judaism. It is true, that these passages present difficulties. For it is not

very easy to determine with exactness what were the Jewish conceptions respecting angels in every period of their history. Hence, as we have mentioned, there are two modes of explaining the fact, that the terms, "the angel of God," and "God" or "Jehovah" are used interchangeably.

One of the modes of explaining the passages, that which is most common amongst the English Unitarians, and which has the support of high authority amongst the Germans, as also of Professor Stuart of Andover,* is, that the angel is of itself nothing personal, but only a sensible manifestation of the divine presence, in the human form or otherwise, employed as the instrument of accomplishing his purposes; in other words, that the angel was Jehovah himself manifesting himself in a flame, &c., or in the body of a man, having no existence after the purposes of the mission were accomplished. This theory commends itself by its simplicity, and will perhaps explain some of the passages in question; but we doubt whether it will explain all of them, or whether it will account for all the facts of the case. The origin of the Jewish conceptions respecting angels and the process of their formation are one thing; and the actual conceptions of the Jews, in the time of the authors of the Pentateuch and the Book of Judges, are another. And, whatever may be thought of the opinion of De Wette, that angels were originally personifications of extraordinary operations of nature, or of remarkable providences, we doubt very much whether the representation in the passages under consideration is, that the angel was nothing personal of itself.

In order to arrive at a just conclusion, it may be well to investigate the meaning of the word translated *angel*. It is a word of not infrequent occurrence, and its signification may be ascertained by Scripture usage.

מַלְאָךְ is derived from a verb not in use in the Hebrew language, but found in the Arabic and Æthiopic, and denoting *to send as a messenger, — legavit, misit nuntium.* See Gesen. ad לְאַךְ. It is used everywhere, at least a hundred times,† in the Old Testament, to denote a messenger from a private person or a king. Wherever in the common version the words

* See De Wette's *Dogmatik*, p. 81; and Stuart's *Hebrew Chrestomathy*, p. 167, n. 2, where he explains מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה in Exod. iii. 2, "Jehovah as manifesting himself to Moses, Jehovah as exhibited by symbol."

† See Taylor's Concordance.

"messenger," "messengers," "ambassadors" occur, they are the translation of מַלְאָךְ in the singular or plural. It is sometimes applied to a prophet, as in Haggai i. 13, and sometimes to a priest, as in Malachi ii. 7, and once, in Isaiah xlii. 19, to the nation of Israel, as the ambassador of God and teacher of the nations. When not used to denote angels, it always denotes a personal agent, a messenger. Nor, if we put the passages under consideration out of view, is there more reason for supposing that it can be applied to an inanimate substance, than the Greek ἄγγελος, or the Latin *nuncius*, or the English *messenger*, *legate*, or *ambassador*.

We think it probable, therefore, that, when the word is used to denote the instruments employed to make known the will of God from heaven, it always denotes personal agents; personal, intelligent messengers. We think that those writers have failed, who have undertaken to prove that the word in question does not include the idea of an intelligent spirit, but that it denotes whatever thing may bear a message, and that it is as applicable to a letter, to a message, to a disease, to any agency or manifestation of God, or to any of the powers of nature, as to a personal messenger. We think the writers in question have confounded plain and figurative language. Thus the fourth verse of Psalm civ. "He maketh the winds his messengers, the flaming lightnings his ministers," is set forth by some writers as an express declaration of the meaning of the word, as denoting an inanimate as well as an intelligent agent. The truth is, this verse proves the very reverse of what it is alleged to prove. It loses half its beauty, unless you understand the word in question to denote a personal, intelligent messenger. For the meaning is, not merely that God makes use of the winds or lightnings to accomplish his purposes, but that these elements, so uncontrollable by man, execute his commands as if they were endowed with intelligence, like personal messengers and servants. That the Hebrew term, as well as the English *messenger*, may be applied in a figurative sense to an inanimate object, is plain. Affliction is sometimes said to be a messenger of mercy. But even in this case the word "messenger" does not lose its primary signification.

In 1 Chron. xxi. 14, it is said, "So the Lord sent a pestilence upon Israel," and in the following verse, "And God sent an angel to Jerusalem to destroy it." And from this it has been concluded, that "pestilence" and "angel" mean precisely

the same thing. But how do they, who adopt this opinion, account for the fact that David "saw the angel of the Lord stand between the earth and heaven having a drawn sword in his hand," — and that "he stood by the threshing-floor of Ornan the Jebusite," — and that "Jehovah *said* to the angel, that destroyed, Stay now thine hand"? The conception of the historian evidently was, that Jehovah sent a personal angel, and that the angel caused the disease.

As far then as Hebrew usage is concerned we have no reason to suppose that the Hebrew מַלְאָךְ has any greater latitude of signification, than the English *messenger*.

It does not follow, however, but that it may, in a figurative sense, be applied to other than personal agents. Whether it is so, must be decided by the connexion in which the word is used, and other considerations. All that we maintain is, that there is nothing in the meaning of מַלְאָךְ which makes it more applicable to an inanimate object, than the English word *messenger*.

The common meaning of the term, as established by Scripture usage, as denoting a personal messenger, is not, then, very favorable to the theory we are now examining.

2. The conceptions of the Jews concerning angels, as manifested in the Pentateuch, are intimated in the dream of Jacob's ladder. Gen. xxviii. 12. It was a vision, but a vision implying a belief of personal agents, called "angels," in the narrator. Again, we read that angels of God *met* Jacob. Gen. xxxii. 1. When, therefore, it is said in the passages in question, that an angel appeared, &c., is it not correct to suppose the meaning to be, that one of those ministering angels, which are represented as ascending and descending, appeared?

3. Particular expressions in the passages in question seem also to imply, that the angel was regarded as a person distinct from God. Thus Exodus xxiii. 20, compared with xxxiii. 2, 3. This is still more manifest in subsequent writers. See 2 Sam. xxiv. 16; Job i. and iv. 18. Even the language of Exodus iii. 2, the passage which is most favorable to the theory under consideration, is not exactly what we should have expected if it were correct. It is there said, "An angel of Jehovah appeared to him *in* a flame of fire," &c.

Though not free from doubt, we think that the explanation

of the older interpreters is the true one; namely, that by the "angel of Jehovah" is meant a personal angel, minister and representative of God, through whom God manifested himself, and by whom God executed his purposes, spoke, and acted. The angels, mentioned in the passages under consideration, not only spoke and acted in the name of God, as commissioned by him, but his name, his *numen*, divine spirit, was in them, in such a sense as it might be in many at the same time, so that they represented his person, and did not, like the prophets, commence their communications with, "Thus saith the Lord," but suffered their own personality to sink into the back-ground. We know that there was a tendency even in Moses and the prophets to forget their own personality, in communicating the will of God, and to confound themselves, as it were, with Him who commissioned them. Thus in Deuteronomy xi. 13, 15, Moses is represented as addressing the Israelites: "And it shall come to pass, if ye shall hearken diligently unto my commandments, which I command you this day, to love Jehovah, your God, and to serve him with all your heart and with all your soul, that *I will give you* the rain of your land in its due season, ... and I will send grass in thy fields." So Deut. xxix. 2, 5, 6. "And Moses called together all Israel, and said to them, ... I have led you forty years in the wilderness; your clothes have not waxen old upon you, nor your shoes waxen old upon your feet; ye have not eaten bread, nor drunk wine, nor strong drink; that ye may know that *I am Jehovah*, your God." So xxxi. 22, 23; Gen. xlix. 7; Jer. xiv. 13. Is. vii. 3, 10. If then such language is naturally used respecting mortal men, living upon the earth, having numerous social relations, and engaged in other concerns besides that of communicating God's will, it is not unnatural, that still stronger language should be used in reference to angels, who are represented as existing merely to be ministering spirits around the throne of God, having no other employment than that of being sent from his immediate presence to bear his messages and execute his commands. We do not say, that the language used respecting Moses and the prophets is precisely similar to that used respecting the angels. But we do think it has such a resemblance to it, as to make our explanation of the language respecting the angels natural and probable.

This explanation has been in substance adopted by a host

of interpreters of all denominations, such as Grotius,* Le Clerc, † Calvin, ‡ and almost all the Roman Catholic interpreters. Amongst the Fathers it was adopted by Origen, who says in his note upon Exodus xx. 3; "God was there seen in the angel," which is to be understood by taking into view a passage in his work against Celsus, "Let us see how this professor of universal knowledge, Celsus, (Lib. I.) calumniates the Jews, saying that they are worshippers of angels, and addicted to the jugglery, which they learned from Moses. Where in the writings of Moses did he find, that that lawgiver commanded angels to be worshipped?" Also by Jerome, who says in his note on Gal. iii. 19; "When he says that the law was ordained by angels, it is meant, that in all the Old Testament, where an angel is first represented as seen, and is then introduced speaking as God, the angel seems really to be one of many ministers." Also by Gregory, who says, "Now they are called *the angels*, now, *the Lord*; because by the word 'angels' those are expressed, who ministered without; and under the appellation 'Lord,' he is intended, who presided over them within." § And especially by Augustine, who says, "It is

---

* Errant graviter, qui hic per angelum intelligunt secundam Dei hypostasin ob illud nomen יְהוָה. Variis enim multiplicibusque modis Deus locutus est patribus; at per Filium ultimis demum temporibus ad nos cœpit loqui. Heb. i. 1. . . . . Quomodo, igitur, is qui legem pronunciavit angelus dicit, ego יְהוָה, ita et alii, qui ad res magnas a Deo legati sunt, angeli loquuntur, sicut verba judicis præco enunciat."—Grotius on Exod. xx. 1.

† Nomen Jehovæ, si propriè loquamur, non tribuitur angelis, sed Deo in iis apparenti; quemadmodum, nullâ ratione instrumenti habitâ, ei qui instrumento utitur actio tribui solet. Sic dicitur rex scripsisse, quod scriba regius exaravit. . . . . Nec periculum fuit, ne Israelitæ pro Deo angelum propterea colerent; obversabatur enim eorum animis Deus deorum, cœli et terræ Creator: seu ipse loqueretur, seu per interpretem angelum, nihil intererat, rectè ad eum ferebatur eorum cultus."—Le Clerc on Gen. xvi. 13.

‡ His note upon Is. lxiii. 9, is as follows. "Vocatur hic angelus faciei, quia testis fuit Dei præsentiæ, et quasi ejus apparitor ad jussa exsequenda; ne putemus angelos prodire a seipsis, aut proprio motu se ingerere, ut opem nobis ferant, sed a Deo mitti, ut sint ministri salutis nostræ. Ergò ne hæreamus in ipsis, quum ad Deum rectè nos ducunt. Potest de Christo exponi."

§ Greg. M. Mor. Lib. 28, c. 1.

therefore manifest, that all those things, which were seen by the fathers, when God was presented to them in accordance with a dispensation adapted to their times, were transacted by the agency of creatures. And if we are unable to say in what way he did these things by the agency of angels, still we assert, that these things were done by angels, not relying, however, upon our own reason. . . . . For we have the authority of the divine Scriptures, &c." Heb. ii. 2. "But, says some one, Why is it then written, The Lord spoke to Moses? Why not rather, The angel spoke to Moses? For the same reason as when a herald pronounces the words of the judge, it is not written in the records of the court, *The herald said*, but, *The judge said.* . . . . . I suppose it now to be sufficiently demonstrated, that, when God is said to appear to our ancient fathers, before the incarnation of the Saviour, those words or corporeal forms were exhibited by angels." *

Here, in relation to the first proposition, which Hengstenberg aims to establish, namely, that the angel, in the passages in question, is a person distinct from Jehovah and yet essentially the same being with him, is an end of the argument, so far as the Old Testament is concerned. But our author has sought to strengthen his position by taking the subject into the wilderness of Jewish tradition, and thither we are obliged to follow him or leave our article incomplete. We shall just remark in the first place, however, that if all that he attempts to prove from the Midrashim and the Cabalists, and much more, were conceded to him, it would not have the least weight with us in the interpretation of the passages in question. But, reserving some remarks on this point for a subsequent part of our article, we are willing to investigate the opinions of the Jews on the subject. But we will not confine ourselves, as Hengstenberg has done, to the most modern and most obscure of the Jewish writers, the Allegorists and the Cabalists, but will examine the more ancient sources of Jewish opinions, as well as those to which he has referred.

The most ancient source of Jewish opinions, independent of the Bible, is the Alexandrine version or Septuagint, which, or the greater part of which, was made probably more than one hundred and thirty years before Christ. †

* Augustin. de Trinitate, iii. 11.

† See the Prologue of Ecclesiasticus.

The Alexandrine version clearly favors the view we have given of "the angel of Jehovah," as being no particular, pre-eminent, uncreated angel, the second person in the Trinity, but only a common angel, one of many. In every one of the passages in question, when the angel is introduced, the article is omitted before it. It is simply *ἄγγελος κυρίου, an* angel, not *ὁ ἄγγελος, the* angel. Nor is the omission of the article accidental. For, after the angel has been introduced, the article is always used, to denote the particular angel before mentioned. See Gen. xvi. 7, &c., xxii. 11; Exod. iii. 2; Judges vi. 11, xiii. 3. In Judges xiii. 21, we have a striking illustration of the preceding remarks. "But *the* angel of the Lord," *ὁ ἄγγελος,* i. e. *the* angel which had appeared to them before, "did no more appear to Manoah and to his wife. Then Manoah knew that he was *an* angel of the Lord," *ἄγγελος.*

The opinion of the Alexandrine translators is also manifested in Judges ii. 1. The Hebrew is like the Common Version. "An angel of the Lord came up from Gilgal to Bochim, and said, I made you to go up out of Egypt," &c. In the Septuagint, before the words "I made you to go up," &c. we find the explanatory interpolation, *Τάδε λέγει ὁ κύριος.*

Indeed so far are the Alexandrine translators from favoring the Trinity, that St. Jerome, in his preface to the Pentateuch, says, that, "whenever they found any thing relating to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, they explained it in a different way, or were wholly silent about it." *

The Apocrypha we have not examined sufficiently to be able to say what were the opinions of the authors in relation to our subject. Hengstenberg quotes nothing from them. Two passages used to be quoted, with the view of showing the belief of the writer in a second person in God, from "The Wisdom of Solomon," the production of a Jewish philosopher of Alexandria, who lived probably not far from the times of our Saviour. One is in chapter xviii. 15, 16; "Thine almighty Logos leapt down from heaven from his royal throne into the midst of a land doomed to destruction, bearing a sharp sword, thy unfeigned † (*ἀνυπόκριτον*) commandment, and, standing, he filled all things with death; and he touched the heaven, and stood

* See the passage in the common editions of the Vulgate.

† i. e. probably, *not to be recalled, sure to be executed.*

upon the earth." From the general character of this description, as well as from other parts of the book, in which it is contained,* we infer that the Logos here mentioned is not a person, but only a personification of the energy of God. I believe this is now generally admitted.

One other passage used to be quoted from the Apocrypha, viz. Eccles. li. 10, "I called upon the Lord, the Father of my Lord," &c. It is difficult to see how this verse can be supposed to prove any thing in regard to the Deity of the Messiah, if it were supposed to be genuine. But it is now generally admitted that the text is corrupt, and that it should be, "I called upon the Lord, upon my Father and Lord," &c.

After the Apocrypha we come to Josephus and Philo, who were contemporaries, and both of them contemporaries with the Apostles of our Saviour.

Josephus evidently understood those passages to speak of any angel, and not one preëminent angel. "*An* angel," ἄγγελος, not ὁ ἄγγελος, or ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου, met Hagar.† He regards the three men who appeared to Abraham, as three angels, and does not seem to suppose that one of them was superior to the other two. "They declared that they were angels of God; ἐμήνυσαν ἑαυτοὺς ὄντας ἀγγέλους τοῦ θεοῦ,‡ and that one of them was sent to inform them about the child, and two for the overthrow of Sodom." ‖

---

* See chapters viii., ix., &c. † Ant. i. 11. ‡ Ant. i. 12.

‖ Other writers have a similar tradition. "Joma, fol. 37, 1; De tribus angelis ministerialibus, qui ad Abrahamum venerunt, Michael fuit medius, Gabriel ad dextram, Raphael ad sinistram. Bava mezia, fol. 86, 2; Quænam fuit differentia inter tres viros, Michaelem, Gabrielem, et Raphaelem? Resp. Michael venit ad annunciandum Saræ [de filio nascituro]; Raphael venit ad sanandum Abrahamum [a doloribus circumcisionis]; Gabriel abiit ad evertendum Sodomam. Objectio: Scriptum est autem Gen. xix. 1, 'Et venerunt duo angeli Sodomam vespera.' Resp. Michael cum eo ivit, ut Lotum eriperet. Breschith rabba, sect. 48, fol. 47, 1, ad verba Gen. xviii. 2; 'Et vidit,' Schechinam scil. et angelos. Postea col. 2, ad verba v. 3, 'Domine si inveni gratiam,' R. Chija dixit: Ad maximum eorum hæc verba dixit, et hic fuit Michael. Sohar Gen. fol. 65, col. 257; Unus ex angelis venit, ut annunciaret Saræ de filio, et hic fuit Michael. Sohar Gen. fol. 67, col. 264; Schechinah venerat, reliqui vero sub illo erant instar throni." The two last passages, taken together and compared with the narrative in Genesis, show that the meaning of the latter is, not that the Shekinah was one of the angels, as some suppose, but that it was, like a bright light, over all three of them. So upon chap. xix. 1, "and Lot saw," the Sohar says,

Where in Genesis it is said, they, i. e. the angels, smote the men with blindness, Josephus says, "God smote them with blindness." So in describing the appearance of an angel to the wife of Manoah,* he says, "An apparition was seen by him; it was *an* angel of God, ἄγγελος τοῦ θεοῦ, and resembled a young man beautiful and tall, and brought her the news that she should have a son, born by God's providence, &c. He exhorted her also not to poll his hair, and that he should avoid all other kinds of drink, (for so had God commanded,) and be entirely contented with water. So the angel, when he had delivered that message, went his way, his coming having been by the will of God. . . . . *She entreated God to send the angel* again, that he might be seen by her husband. So the angel came again by the favor of God." Yet he says afterwards, "Now Manoah was afraid that some danger would come to them from this *sight of God*, ἐκ τῆς ὄψεως τοῦ θεοῦ, but his wife bade him be of good courage, for that God had appeared, τὸν θεὸν ὡρασθῆναι, for their benefit."

We see, then, that the same use of language prevails in Josephus, as is found in the passages in the Old Testament. The meaning of Josephus evidently is, that God was manifested by means of the angel, as his messenger or representative. There was a proverb among the Jews, that the sent was equal to the sender.† The meaning of Josephus is made obvious by a comparison of two passages. In Ant. Lib. III. c. 4, (III. 5, 4, in Whiston,) he says, "He brought the people with their wives and children so near the mountain, that they might *hear God speaking to them*, ἀκούσαιεν τοῦ θεοῦ διαλεγομένου, about the precepts, which they were to practise." But in Lib. XV. 8, (XV. 5, 3, in Whiston,) "Our ambassadors, which they have beheaded, while the Greeks declare that such ambassadors are sacred and inviolable. And for ourselves, we have learned from God the most excellent of our doctrines, and the most holy part of our law, by angels, i. e. messengers, δι' ἀγγέλων. For this name can bring God to the knowledge,

---

"Vidit Schechinam. An vero aliquis videre potest Schechinam? Resp. Vidit splendorem unum super capita eorum ascendentem, et propterea dixit, 'Ecce, quæso, domine.'" — Schoettgen, Vol. II. p. 442.

* Ant. V. 10. 2.

† Mechilta fol. 5, 1, et 49, 2. Tanchuma fol. 16, 3. Kidduschin fol. 42, 1. "Invenimus ubique, quod missus mittenti par æstimetur." — Schoettgen, Vol. I. p. 387.

or the view, εἰς ἐμφάνειαν,* of mankind, and reconcile enemies one to another." Observe that it is said, that God was heard, and that he was brought to the knowledge or view of mankind by angels, not an angel, or the angel. It cannot therefore be pretended, that Josephus supposed the second person in the Trinity, or any preëminent angel partaking of the nature of God, to be denoted by the "angel" in the passages under consideration. Moreover, he says nothing about such a person, when speaking of the fundamental doctrine of Judaism, "God is but one;" Ant. III. 5, 5; IV. 8, 5. And when we consider the known sentiments of the great body of the Jews in the times of Josephus, our views respecting his opinions on the present subject are still more confirmed.

There may be a question whether Josephus regarded angels as having an independent and permanent personal existence. We suppose that he did so regard them, judging from the above quoted passages, and from Ant. I. 3, 1. See Whiston's translation.

It cannot be expected that we should go into a very particular examination of the sentiments of Philo, the Jewish philosopher of Alexandria.† We suppose, that no one at the present day will pretend that his doctrines or notions are Jewish traditions, or that they were derived from the Alexandrine version of the Old Testament. Many of his representations clearly have no other source than his own imagination. The chief source of them was the philosophy of Plato. He has no reference to the Messiah in all his writings. Schoettgen observes of him and the authors of "The Wisdom of Solomon" and "Ecclesiasticus," that concerning the Messiah, "magis muti sunt quam pisces." Schoettgen also says of the Alexandrine writers, "You may call them Semi-Jews more properly than Jews, ... for a knowledge of the Hebrew or Chaldee lan-

* Josephus sometimes speaks of a manifestation of God where there was no visible appearance. Thus, Ant. XV. 11, 7. "It is reported, that during the time the Temple was building, it did not rain in the day time, but that the showers fell in the nights, so that the work was not hindered. . . . . Nor is it incredible, if any one have regard to the other manifestations of God," εἰ καὶ πρὸς τὰς ἄλλας ἐπίδοι τις ἐμφανείας τοῦ θεοῦ.

† For a more general and the best account, with which we are acquainted, of his notions respecting the Logos, see Norton's *Statement of Reasons*, &c. pp. 227–288.

guage, or of oral Jewish traditions, has been sought in vain in Philo by Jewish and Christian writers." *

Still, as many have sought to identify what they call the second person in the Trinity with the Logos of Philo, and as Hengstenberg has adduced one passage from his writings, we must not pass him by without notice; especially as we have no doubt, that his doctrine of the Logos, being incorporated with Christianity by Justin Martyr and the Fathers, was gradually matured into the doctrine of the Trinity.

There can be no doubt that the Logos was often regarded by Philo as a person, and it is true that he calls the angel, mentioned in the passages under consideration, a Logos or the Logos. Thus in regard to the appearance of the angel to Hagar, he says, "An angel having met her, which is a, or the, divine Logos." † There is some doubt whether by the angel he always means what he calls "the most ancient Logos," "the archangel with many titles"; because in several passages he calls angels in general *Logoi.* Thus in speaking of Jacob's ladder, he says, "The ladder denotes the air, which is the habitation of spirits without bodies. Of these spirits the purest and best, ... being ministers of the Almighty, as it were the eyes and ears of a great king, seeing and hearing all things, are by philosophers called dæmons; but in the Scriptures they receive the more appropriate appellation of angels. For they bear the commands of the Father to his offspring, and the prayers of the children to the Father." ‡ "These Logoi of God, *οἱ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγοι,* ascend and descend the ladder without ceasing." § He says also that Jacob chose one of these Logoi, ‖ the highest in excellence, and brought him near to his head, upon which to rest it as upon a stone, i. e. to whom he might apply his mind as a teacher. And this Logos, he says, taught Jacob to wrestle, &c. In one passage, to be quoted hereafter, he calls the angel that appeared to Jacob in Bethel, "the most ancient Logos."

But whether he always understood this "most ancient Logos" to be denoted by the angel or not, it is very plain that he understood by him a being inferior to God. Thus, in

* Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ, Vol. II. p. 39.
† De Cherubim, I. p. 139. Edit. Mangey.
‡ De Somniis, p. 642. See also De Gigant. I. p. 263.
§ De Somniis, p. 643.
‖ *τούτων δὲ τῶν λόγων ἵνα λαβὼν,* &c. De Somniis, p. 640.

reference to Hagar's expression, "Thou art a God, who mayst be seen." Philo says, "Angels, the servants of God, are regarded as Gods by those who are subject to servitude, and to wearisome labors." *

In commenting upon Gen. xlviii. 15, "May God, ... who fed me all my life long unto this day, the angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads," he says, "The more ancient blessings, by which the soul is nourished, are ascribed to God; but the later, which relate to escape from sins, are ascribed to a servant of God, θεράποντι θεοῦ." †

He says, "The angel, the ministering Logos of God, gave another name to Jacob." He then undertakes to assign a reason why Jacob was sometimes called by his former name, after it was changed to that of Israel, whilst Abraham was never called Abram after his name was changed. "It was," he says, "because the unchangeable God gave Abraham his name, so that it might remain stable; but the name of Jacob was changed by an angel, a, or the, ministering Logos of God, ἄγγελος, ὑπηρέτης τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος, so that it might be seen, that none of those things, or beings, which are beneath the Supreme Being, τῶν μετὰ τὸ ὄν, can be the cause of stability." ‡

That Philo did not regard the Logos as God in the proper sense of the term, is also evident from another passage. "Do not," says he, "overlook that which is said, 'I am God that appeared to thee in the place of God' [Bethel]; but diligently inquire whether there be two Gods; for it is said, 'I am God that appeared to thee,' not 'in *my* place,' but 'in the place of God,' as being another. What then shall we answer. He that is in truth, or reality, God, ὁ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ Θεὸς, is one; but they who in a loose, or figurative sense, (ἐν καταχρήσει,) are so called, are many. Therefore the holy Scripture in this passage denotes him that is in truth God by the use of the article prefixed to the name, saying 'I am ὁ Θεὸς'; but him who is God only in a figurative sense, or by a figurative use of language, he introduces without the article prefixed to the word, saying, 'He that appeared to thee in the place' not 'τοῦ Θεοῦ,' but only 'Θεοῦ.' And he here calls his most

* De Profugis, I. p. 577.

† Ibid. p. 556. See the same thing in, De Confus. Ling. I. p. 432, and Legg. Alleg. Lib. III. Opp. I. p. 122.

‡ De Nominum Mutatione, I. p. 591.

ancient Logos God, without an over-scrupulous concern respecting the application of names." *

Speaking of Moses he says, "He uses the, or a, divine Logos, as the guide of his way, according to the oracle, Exod. xxiii. 20; Behold, I send my angel before thee," &c. And immediately after he says, "But after he has arrived at the height of knowledge, moving at a swift pace he will come up with him, who before led the way, i. e. the Logos. And then both, i. e. Moses and the Logos, will be attendants of the all-governing God." †

Again, "Let him, then, who is not yet worthy to be called a son of God, strive to fashion himself to the resemblance of God's first-born Logos, the most ancient angel, being as it were an archangel with many titles." ‡

Respecting the appearance of the angels to Abraham, as related in Gen. xviii., there are two representations in Philo. We will merely quote them, leaving it to others to decide, whether they are consistent, or whether he regarded them as consistent, with each other. "If some have thought that house fortunate and happy, in which wise men have happened to be received as guests, how shall I describe the height of good fortune and happiness, which belong to that house, in which angels, those sacred and divine beings (ἱεραὶ καὶ θεῖαι φύσεις), ministers and prophets of the Supreme God, by whom as ambassadors and messengers he communicates whatever he pleases to mankind, have deigned to tarry and receive hospitalities from men." §

The other is as follows. "For Abraham also, coming with zeal and haste and great alacrity, orders Sarah, who represents virtue, to hasten and mix three measures of fine meal and make hearth-cakes, when God, accompanied by his two principal powers, his royalty and his goodness, He, in the midst of them, being one, produced three images in the visual soul (τῇ ὁρατικῇ ψυχῇ), each of which could by no means be measured, for God is incomprehensible, and his powers are incomprehensible; but he measures all things, for his goodness is the measure of good men, his power is

* De Somniis, Lib. 1. Opp. 1. p. 655.
† De Migratione Abrahami, I. p. 463.
‡ De Confusione Linguarum, I. 427.
§ De Abramo, quoted by Le Clerc on Exod. xviii. 1.

the measure of his subjects, but he himself, the Sovereign, is the measure of all corporeal and incorporeal things. Wherefore these powers, obtaining the nature of rules and precepts, are a means of estimating things inferior to them. These three measures, then, it is good to have mingled and worked together in the soul, that, being persuaded that God is supremely exalted, who rises above his own powers, and is either perceived without them, or manifested in them, it may receive the impressions of his power and beneficence, and, being initiated into the most perfect mysteries, may not readily utter those divine secrets, but, using them cautiously, and preserving silence upon them, may keep them sacred." *

One other passage deserves our attention, because it is the only one quoted from Philo by Hengstenberg. It is adduced by him for the purpose of showing that the Cabalistic doctrine of the Metatron is as old as the time of Philo. What the passage proves is, that the Logos was regarded by Philo as a mediator, as the Metatron was regarded by the Cabalists as a mediator. We will quote the passage in the original, as we wish to give a specimen of the American translator's knowledge of Greek. It is as follows: *Τῷ δὲ ἀρχαγγέλῳ καὶ πρεσβυτάτῳ λόγῳ δι' ἀρετὴν [δωρεὰν] ἐξαίρετον ἔδωκεν ὁ τὰ ὅλα γεννήσας πατὴρ, ἵνα μεθόριον[ς] στὰς τὸ γενόμενον διακρίνῃ τοῦ πεποιηκότος. ὃ δὲ αὐτὸς ἱκέτης μέν ἐστι τοῦ θνητοῦ κηραίνοντος ἀεὶ πρὸς τὸ ἄφθαρτον, πρεσβευτὴς δὲ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος πρὸς τὸ ὑπήκοον.*†

Hengstenberg does not translate the passage. The translator in the Repository renders it thus.

"To the archangel and eldest Logos, on account of his peculiar excellence, the Father who begat all things, has given to stand as the one, who divides that which is made, from Him who made it; *and he is the object of supplication to the mortal destined for immortality, the ambassador of him who leads to obedience.*"

The true meaning, which we give in a translation rather more literal than is perfectly consistent with the English idiom, is as follows.

"To the archangel, the eldest Logos, the Father of all

---

* De Sacrif. Abel. et Cain. Vol. I. p. 173.
† Quis rerum divin. Hæres. I. 501.

things freely gave the distinguished office of standing on the confines, and separating that which is made from him that made it. The same is, on the one hand, *the intercessor to the Incorruptible for the continually perishing mortal, and, on the other, the messenger from the Ruler to the subject.*"

What an exalted opinion of American scholarship must be entertained by the German linguists to whom the Andover Repository has been sent, if they judge from such specimens of it.

We think it plain from all our quotations from Philo, that when he speaks of the Logos as a person, he regards him as dependent, and as inferior to God.

Hengstenberg does not appeal to the Chaldee paraphrases. We have examined the oldest of them, those of Onkelos and Jonathan, and find in them no support for the opinion of the identity of the angel with Jehovah. The Targum of Onkelos is generally a literal translation of the Hebrew. Yet, in his version of Exodus xxiii. 21, he has indicated his opinion in relation to the subject. The expression, "for my name is in him," which Hengstenberg supposes to mean that the angel partook of the nature of Jehovah, Onkelos renders, "for his word," i. e. the word of the angel, "is in my name," i. e. with my authority.

The Targum of Jonathan upon Isaiah lxiii. 9, does not favor the idea of the identity of the angel with Jehovah. The phrase, "the angel of his presence," is by him rendered, "the angel *sent* from his presence."

We are glad to find that the expression, "the word of Jehovah" in the Chaldee paraphrasts is not brought forward by Hengstenberg, as denoting a person distinct from Jehovah. We presume he was satisfied that the word of a person in the targums is but a fuller expression to denote the person himself. Thus, Job vii. 8, "Thine eyes are upon me" is in the targum "Thine eyes are upon my word." Job xxvii. 3, "My spirit within me" is in the targum "My spirit in my word." 2 Chron. xvi. 3, "There is a league between me and thee," is in the targum "between my word and thy word." So the word of Jehovah denotes merely Jehovah himself. Formerly, when we were in the habit of taking quotations upon trust more than we now are, we were puzzled with an error, which we do

not remember to have seen corrected, in a reference of Dr. Allix to Psalm cx. 1, which he says was rendered in the Targum of Jonathan, "Jehovah said *to* his word." The same assertion is found in Taylor's Ben Mordecai's Letters,* supported by a quotation from Bishop Bull's Works. But, upon examining the passage, we find it to be "Jehovah spake *by* his word," אֲמַר יְיָ בְּמֵימְרֵיהּ, i. e. "Jehovah by himself," or "Jehovah himself." The preposition ל not ב would certainly have been used to denote *to*. The expression is one of not infrequent occurrence in the targums. Thus, "By myself I have sworn" is in the targum "By my word I have sworn." בְּמֵימְרִי. See Gen. xxii. 16, Ex. vi. 8, Ezek. xvi. 8, Is. xii. 3, in the targums of Onkelos and Jonathan. The meaning of the Chaldee Paraphrast in regard to Psalm cx. 1, is also obvious from the context: "Jehovah said by his word, that he would make me king of all Israel. But he said moreover, Wait thou till Saul dies."†

Hengstenberg's principal reliance in regard to Jewish tradition is upon the writings of the Cabalists, whose great aim is to find mysteries in the letters of the words of the Bible, and especially in the letters of the name "Jehovah." The book Sohar, of which we shall speak hereafter, is his principal authority. He thinks he finds the doctrine of an angel, who was "a distinct person from God and yet God himself," in the Metatron of the Cabalists. We think that the fair conclusion from the passages, which he adduces, is, that the angel Metatron was not regarded by any of them in any other light than as the first of angels, the high chancellor of Heaven, as Buxtorf says he is called in the Targum of Jonathan, whom nothing separated from God, i. e. between whom and God no being intervened. We think it probable that the name Metatron is an appellative derived from the Latin *metator*, i. e. one who goes before an army to prepare the camp, &c. The exalted character, which the Cabalists have ascribed to him, may have

* Page 348.

† As to the cause of the Paraphrast's rendering, I suppose he read or regarded לַאדֹנָי as לֵאדֹנָי; and, as ל denotes *by* as well as *to*, of course he would understand it "Jehovah said by the Lord"; and this, according to the idiom explained on page 214, would be the same as, "Jehovah said by himself," or "Jehovah himself said"; and this meaning he expressed by saying, "Jehovah said by his word."

been derived from the Logos of Philo in part, and in part from the passages of the Old Testament respecting angels. He is everywhere called an angel, and represented as created, and as having received all his power from God. Thus in the passage quoted by Hengstenberg, as setting forth his highest attributes. It is a mystical comment in Sohar upon Genesis xxiv. 2, "And Abraham said unto the eldest servant of his house." "The Metatron is the servant of Jehovah, the eldest of his household, the beginning of his creatures,* exercising dominion over all things, which have been committed to him, and God has delivered to him the dominion over all his hosts."

In another from the same book, quoted in Schoett. II. p. 17, "The Metatron is the middle pillar, who makes peace with the higher, as that beauty, whose name is as the name of his Lord, created after his image and likeness, comprehending all steps or degrees above downward and down upward, terminating in the middle state," *concludens in medietate*, (i. e. in being between the Supreme Being and his creatures.)

When the Cabalist says that the name of the Metatron is "as the name of his Lord," we presume he refers to the circumstance, that the angel, which appeared to the patriarch, is sometimes called God. But it is wholly inconsistent with the rest of the passage, to suppose that he regarded the servant as the same being with his lord.

That by the phrase, "beginning of his creatures," he understood "the first creature that was made," is evident from other passages. Thus,† "In the beginning God created, i. e. the Metatron, whom God created the first and the beginning of his whole host of heaven and things below. This is the little Adam, (elsewhere called Adam Cadmon, or the first Adam,) whom God made in his higher image and likeness without any mixture."

It may be true, as Hengstenberg endeavours to show by a quotation from R. Ruben fil. Hoshke, that the Cabalists speak of two Metatrons, a higher, and a lower who was said to be

---

* i. e. the first being created, as it is understood by Schoettgen, who sometimes has "initium," sometimes "principium"; and, for aught we know, by all who have quoted it. See Schoett. Vol. II. p. 367.

† Tikkune Sohar, c. 67. Schoett. II. p. 410.

Enoch.* But the passages above quoted relate to the higher Metatron, and as such are brought forward by Hengstenberg.

Another reason against the supposition that the Cabalists regarded the Metatron as the same being with Jehovah, is, that they thought him to be the angel Michael. This is expressly asserted by Schoettgen, (II. p. 17,) and by Hengstenberg. But that the angel Michael was regarded by any of the Jews as identical with the Supreme Being is a supposition at war with all their traditions, and also with the Scriptures. Jude, 9. He was regarded as one of the angels of God, though the first of them. He was the opposer of Sammael or Satan before God in the court of heaven.† He is also represented as the high priest of heaven,‡ and as one who introduces the good into heaven.§ So the Metatron was said to be the opener and the shutter, i. e. one who opens or shuts the gates of prayer or of prophecy.‖

We think we have quoted enough to show that by the Metatron, the Cabalists understood a derived being; (not to use in the strictest sense the term *created*, which may mean that he was formed by emanation from God;) that he was a de-

---

* See Schoett. II. p. 473.

† See Sohar Levit. fol. in Schoettgen, Vol. II. p. 657. "Datur servus bonus et servus malus. Mysterium Metatronis est servus bonus et domino fidelis; mysterium vero Sammaelis est servus malus." See also Sohar, Exod. fol. 102, col. 414, in Schoettgen, p. 659. "Is est Michael, lux dextra, ἐντίτροπος magnus Israelis. Quando enim latus alterum stat ad avertendum seu decipiendum Israelitas, tunc Michael portat populum suum, et factus est συνήγορος pro Israelitis, et liberat eos ab accusatione adversarii. Excepto illo tempore, quo Hierosolyma devastata est; tunc enim prævaluerunt peccata eorum, et Michael nihil potuit efficere contra partem alteram, ut Israelitas portaret. Nam Michael tunc debilis factus est Israelitarum causâ."

Schemoth Rabba, Schoettgen, II. p. 660. "Michael et Sammael stant coram Schechina. Satan accusat, Michael autem excusat."

‡ Sohar Genes. fol. 56, col. 223. Schoettgen, II. 644. "Michael sacerdos summus superior est omnibus illis, qui januas custodiunt, i. e. angelis."

So in Sohar, Schoettgen, II. 643. R. Joseph tradidit; "Quemadmodum sacerdos summus est inferius, sic Michael, princeps magnus, sacerdos est in cœlo superius; et ille prævenit animam, benedicendo ei, postea etiam benedicit (celebrat) Deum sanctum benedictum."

§ So Sohar Genes. fol. 77. col. 303. Dixit R. Isaac. "Quando anima digna est, quæ introducatur per portas Hierosolymæ supernæ, Michael princeps magnus ipsam comitatur, ipsique pacem apud Angelos ministeriales conciliat," &c. Schoettgen, II. 657.

‖ See Schoett. II. p. 325, 661.

pendent being, having a lord, and having received all his offices and powers from God.

Hengstenberg quotes a few passages, which seem to him to prove that he was regarded by the Cabalists as the same being with God; a few especially in which he is called the Shechinah. * It is true that he is so called. But this by no means proves that the Metatron was regarded as identical with the Shechinah, but rather the reverse. It proves only, that the Shechinah *dwelt* with him, or in him. The language is explained by a passage, which he himself quotes from Rabbi Moses Corduero, "The angel here is the *vestment* of the Shechinah, and the Shechinah conceals himself in the midst of him, and shows his operations by him. *Yet is he not the Shechinah itself*, but, if it were proper, I would call him the Shechinah's place of exile." So the temple is called the Shechinah, "the lowest Shechinah," † as the Metatron might be the highest.

So the voice which Adam heard in the garden was the Shechinah. ‡ It was in or with Isaac, when he blessed Jacob. § It dwelt in the hands and fingers of the priest. ‖

---

* Shechinah, שְׁכִינָה, is a Chaldee word, which literally denotes *dwelling*, *habitatio*. Hence it was used to denote that visible brightness, or glory, which dwelt in a place or person, as a token of the divine influence, or the representative of his presence, and sometimes to denote the person or place, in which it dwelt. Exod. xxiv. 16. "And the glory of Jehovah dwelt," &c. וַיִּשְׁכֹּן כְּבוֹד יְהוָה may be considered as the source of the expression.

† Tikkune Sohar, c. 28, fol. 28, 1. "Templum vero est omnium Schechinah infima." Schoettgen, II. 288.

‡ Tikkune Sohar, c. 61. "Vox in horto erat Schechinah." Schoettgen, II. 439.

§ Sohar Genes. fol. 83, col. 382. "Ecce Schechinah fuit cum eo. Nam nisi cum eo habitasset, quomodo Jacobo potuisset benedicere." Again, fol. 85, col. 335. upon Genes. xxvii. 30. "'*Exeundo exivit* Jacobus.' Bis hoc verbum ponitur, semel respectu Schechinæ, postea respectu Jacobi; cum enim Jacobus exiret, Schechinah cum ipso exivit. Nam præsente Schechinâ benedictio facta est. Isaacus verba recitavit, Schechinah vero ipsi adstipulata est." Schoettgen, II. 444.

‖ Sohar chadash, fol. 361. "Quando Israelitæ puri et bendictione digni fuerunt, manus sacerdotis facile, sine difficultate, attolli, et verba cum lætitiâ et voluptate cordis recitari potuerunt. Tunc, cum Schechinah in digitis habitavit, illi semetipsos extulerunt, et sacerdos cognovit, quod Israelitæ benedictione digni essent, iisque cum lætitiâ cordis benedixit." Schoettgen, II. 457.

In the book Sohar we find the following passage respecting Michael. "Wherever you find Michael, who is the first of them, i. e. the angels, there understand the Shechinah." So Schemoth rabba, sect. 2, fol. 104, 3. "Wherever Michael is said to have appeared, there understand it of the glory of the divine majesty." Schoettgen, II. 15. But it is evident from the quotations on page 226, where the Shechinah is said to have hovered over three angels, Michael being amongst them, that all that is meant is, that the Shechinah was *with* him. So Sohar Genes. fol. 84, col. 484. "In that hour Michael was appointed to go to Jacob, and the Shechinah *with him*, because Isaac knew (the Shechinah.") Schoettgen, II. p. 444.

By these passages we presume is to be explained the passage quoted by Hengstenberg from Rabbi Bechai, a writer of the latter part of the thirteenth century, of course an antitrinitarian himself, and "held in high estimation," says Schoettgen, "by the Jews," those determined opposers of the Trinity. R. Bechai says, "The Rabbins explain the words אל תמר בו 'Thou shalt not change me for him,' (in such a way that you shall think me one and him another,) and God says this to Moses that he may understand that both are one, and most intimately united without separation. He is the Lord himself, and at the same time is the ambassador of the Lord." It does not appear from this quotation that it relates to the Metatron. If it does relate to him, it is explained by what is said above of the Shechinah's dwelling in the Metatron, &c. Language very similar is used in the Sohar respecting the Israelites. "Some are sealed by the habitation of the blessed God. These are they who observe the law and perform good works in the name of God and the Shechinah, *who are not separated from them*, but, as children partake of the honor of their father and mother, so every one of them is united and sealed with the middle pillar and the Shechinah. *In him they are as it were one.*" *

---

* Sohar Exod. fol. 49, col. 194. "Alii denique per habitationem Dei S. B., quem confitentur, obsignati sunt. Hi sunt, qui legi et bonis operibus operam dent, nomine Dei S. B. et Schechinæ, qui ab illis non separantur, sed sicut filii solent participare honorem patris et matris, sic unusquisque illorum conjunctus et obsignatus est cum columnâ mediâ et Schechinâ; *in illo quasi unum sunt.*" Schoett. II. p. 276.

Sohar Gen. fol. 85, col. 347. Schoett. p. 338, in a remark upon Jacob's ladder. "Nam Deus S. B. in eis (angelis) descendit, ut Schechinam recipiat, et Deus S. B. cum *tali homine unitur* per preces."

We find also in Tikkune Sohar c. 18, fol. 28, 2, that "many angels ascend with the Shechinah, who are called faces of the Lord." *

If the quotation from R. Bechai relate merely to an angel mentioned in the Pentateuch, he may have adopted the opinion, which has prevailed in modern times, that the angel was nothing personal in itself, but only a visible form, of which the intelligent spirit was God. The known opinions of Bechai, and the Jews with whom he was a popular writer, are sufficient to show, that he did not understand the passage in the sense contended for by Hengstenberg.

Thus we find that there is nothing in the traditions of the Jews to warrant the supposition, that any of them believed in a being, who was a distinct person from God, and yet essentially and numerically the same being with him. In fact we are not sure that Hengstenberg himself believed the Metatron to be one with God in any other sense than as every man is one with Adam, namely, by partaking of the same nature with Adam. He says, "The ancient Jews found in all the passages, where the angel of God is spoken of, neither an inferior angel, nor a natural cause, *nor the invisible God himself*, but the proper mediator between God and the world, the author of all revelations, to whom they gave the name Metatron."

In another passage Hengstenberg appears to make the Jewish doctrine his own. "The New Testament teaches us to know God, the Father of Jesus Christ, as a spirit everywhere present, but who never appears under a form or covering which is subject to the senses. But, besides this invisible God, the New Testament makes us acquainted with a visible or manifested God, united with him by a oneness of nature, the Son or λόγος, who has constantly filled up the endless distance between the Creator and the creation, who has been the medium of communication, the mediator, in all the relations of God with the world and with mankind." Certainly this passage implies a belief that the Father and son are numerically two persons in the strictest sense of the word *person*, and is rather Philonism, than Orthodoxy as it is now understood in

---

* Tikkune Sohar c. 18, fol. 28, 2; in Schoett. II. 326. "Multi angeli ascendunt cum eâ (Schechinâ), qui dicuntur facies Domini."

New England. It varies but little from the Unitarianism of John Milton, Samuel Clarke, and Henry Taylor. But Hengstenberg's occasional remarks are not always consistent with the general statement above quoted. He uses the language, which we have employed in stating his opinions, in regard to the angel's *identifying himself* with God, and *being identical* with the Messiah.

At any rate, whatever may be his language or his opinions, he has failed altogether to establish on any good or sufficient grounds the first of the two propositions, which, as we have seen, are involved in his argument. In our next Number we shall show that he has been equally unsuccessful in regard to the second.

G. R. N.

Art. VI. — *A Sermon delivered in Worcester, January* 31, 1836, by Aaron Bancroft, D. D., *at the Termination of Fifty Years of his Ministry.* Published by Vote of the Society. Worcester: Clarendon Harris. 1836. 8vo. pp. 44.

Dr. Bancroft is one of the last survivors of a class of men, whom the friends of Liberal Christianity will hold in grateful remembrance. He has uniformly, during the lapse of fifty years, maintained a high rank among those, by whose efforts and sacrifices the public mind, to a certain extent, has been delivered from the thrall of creeds and other ecclesiastical impositions, and brought into the "glorious liberty of the sons of God." This change, indeed, in religious opinion and feeling must sooner or later have taken place in this country, and particularly in this part of it. It was, in the nature of things, impossible, that thinking men, after the subsidence of those high-wrought emotions which were caused by the Revolutionary struggle, and when they found leisure to read and reason, and were called to free and generous speculation on all other subjects pertaining to the great interests of life, should remain satisfied with the "beggarly elements" of the popular religion of the day. Still this change, like all other

moral changes, required the agency of clear heads and stout hearts, and of a martyr spirit, that was willing to dare and do all things for conscience' sake. Such men, through the good providence of God, there were; and of their number was the author of the Sermon before us. When we look back through the dim vista of somewhat more than half a century, we see him, together with Mayhew, Chauncy, Howard, Freeman, and some others like them, emerging from the surrounding darkness, illumined by the light of Christian truth above the measure of their age, — as the higher hill-tops catch and diffuse the earliest beams of the rising dawn, — carrying forward and reforming that Reformation, in this part of the world, which Luther, Melancthon, Zuinglius, with their coadjutors, achieved on the broader theatre of Europe. And it becomes us, who have entered into their labors, and are reaping continually the fruits of their firmness, discretion, and freedom of mind, to hold them in cherished respect and in honored remembrance. We should recollect, also, that they lived at a period, when denunciation was less harmless than it is now; when the cry of proscription was something more than an angry or empty noise; when the strong-holds of exclusive religionists, with their "captains of thousands, and captains of fifties," had not, as yet, been weakened by desertion, or betrayed by the unhappy attempts of friends in their defence. Dr. Bancroft says,

"Calvinism was the predominant faith through this section of the Commonwealth when my residence in Worcester commenced. Individual laymen and clergymen were known to dissent from the popular creed; and the clergy as a body at that period, I believe, were more liberal than the people to whom they ministered. Several ministers in this vicinity then thought favorably of liberal doctrines, but they expressed their opinions in qualified language, and, with a single exception, the system of Calvin was not openly attacked from the pulpit. Disputes and controversies were then frequent, but an exclusive spirit did not prevail." — p. 5.

The exception here referred to was that of the Rev. John Rogers, "a name," as Dr. Bancroft observes, "fitted to make a man independent in his opinions, and prepared to encounter every difficulty in defence of religious truth." He was the minister at Leominster, Worcester County, in this State. Being possessed of "intellectual power and an inquisitive spirit," and studying the New Testament more than the

confession and covenant of his church, he was betrayed, in the year 1757, into the startling heresy of publicly preaching against the doctrine of "Irrespective Election." He was not burnt, however, as his ancestor, the protomartyr, was. He was *only* cut off from all the sympathy and companionship of his church; — called to encounter, at every turn, the averted looks and pious horror of former friends; — avoided, as a sort of felon, by the great majority of those who had been his brethren in the ministry for fourteen years; — made to suffer a thousand petty persecutions in all the walks of domestic and social life; — arraigned before a formidable council composed of fifteen churches; — dismissed by this body from his parochial charge; — and then finally left, with this weight of ecclesiastical ignominy on his devoted head, to find a precarious subsistence, in such a world as this, where and as he might. Whether this slow torture of moral and social martyrdom was to be preferred, in point of suffering, to the fires of Smithfield, we do not take upon ourselves to decide. But of one thing we feel quite assured, — that he should henceforth be placed by the side of that great ancestor, whose spirit as well as name he bore, and like him be ever honored for his faithful and single-minded avowal of what he believed to be the truth.

But though the Exclusive spirit, in consequence of the better light that is now diffused among the people, is deprived of much of its power to harm, it has, in the opinion of our author, greatly increased among Congregational Christians during the last fifty years. He cites as a memorable proof of this, the doings of the Convention of Congregational Ministers, who hold their annual meetings in Boston. For many years, it is well known, while liberal clergymen constituted the majority of this body, the preacher of the Annual Lecture, which was established mainly for charitable purposes, was chosen alternately from the Liberal and Orthodox class. But when the latter gained a numerical ascendency, this common courtesy, this common decency, was so far from being reciprocated, that, for several years past, no Unitarian minister has been permited to preach on an occasion, the great object of which is to raise a fund for the support of widows and minor children of deceased members of the Convention, without respect to doctrinal differences. This has been long regarded with the disgust it deserves, both as grossly discourteous and absolutely unjust, in the minds of unprejudiced men. We doubt

not that many, who continue to participate annually in this wrong-doing, and follow submissively in the leash of their leaders, are ashamed of it in their secret hearts. What account the public has taken of it is evident enough from continual decrease of the annual contribution, at the lecture, since the change was made. The average amount of this for four years subsequent to 1816, before the system of Exclusion was carried into effect, was more than five hundred dollars. During four successive years commencing with 1832, in which this system was understood to be in force, the average of this annual contribution has sunk down to the almost nominal sum of less than ninety dollars. It were to be wished that these Exclusive Religionists could find some way of showing their own opinion of their own infallibility and self-righteousness, which would not defeat one of the leading objects of the Convention; and that, if they will turn a deaf ear to all the appeals of Christian Catholicism and Christian Equity, they would at least listen to the cry for the accustomed, and it may be greatly needed aid, which goes up to them from the Widows and Orphans of their deceased brethren.

The plan of Dr. Bancroft's Discourse is, first, to take a cursory review of the Ecclesiastical Transactions of the County (of Worcester,) and then to give a succinct History of the Society to which he has so long ministered.

Under the first head, he speaks of three distinct kinds of controversies which have prevailed, and which related to important principles. 1st. The prerogative of the pastor. 2d. The introduction of creeds compiled by human authority as terms of occasional communion, or of church membership. 3d. The power and right of congregational societies to dismiss a minister by their own act.

Disputes arose, as early as 1766, and were afterwards pertinaciously and angrily prosecuted, concerning the degree of power attached to the clerical office. Pastors, who had been regularly ordained, claimed not only the right of acting as moderators in all church meetings, and to be the executive officers in all the decisions of these bodies, which was conceded; but also to be a party, separate from the church, whose concurrence was necessary to the validity of its acts, and whose *veto* nullified all its proceedings. These prerogatives of the pastoral office were generally asserted by the clergy, as absolutely necessary to the due exercise of their

function, and were as generally resisted by the laity. It would have required no deep spirit of prophecy, to foresee the result of this contest. Men, who freely put their lives into their hands, and were always ready to go out and do battle with every body, and every thing, that infringed their civil rights, were not likely to go home and crouch down quietly under such an ecclesiastical yoke as this. Of course they prevailed. Attempted usurpation in this respect resulted, as it always will and always must ultimately result, in the successful assertion of inherent and indefeasible rights. Indeed at this day, when clergymen ask and receive scarcely any immunities of office, and when even their claims to personal influence are watched with sufficient jealousy, and are accurately enough scanned, this assertion of prerogative, on the part of our older clergy, strikes us as one of the marvels of their day.

An account of creeds as connected with occasional communion or church membership, in Worcester county, is next briefly given. But the history of these is the same all the world over. Arising in a vital mistake respecting the nature of human assent or belief, they can only be enforced by a series of inroads upon the inalienable rights of conscience. These produce a reaction, and thence ensue alienation, discord, hatred, and war, with all its associated and continually increasing train of dreadful evils and horrid sins. There are some home-put remarks, and rather searching queries of Dr. Bancroft on this part of his Discourse, — particularly those respecting the identity of the Calvinism of the Pilgrim fathers, and the Calvinism of those, who at the present day claim to be their exclusively legitimate sons, whether Professors of Colleges or not. These we recommend to the docile attention of all creed-makers, creed-imposers, and creed-receivers, here and elsewhere. The following dilemma, too, seems to admit of no resting-place between its sharp and wide-spreading horns: — "Articles of faith established by human authority cannot on any ground be defended. If these be discordant with revealed truth, they clearly ought to be rejected; if perfectly agreeable to Scripture, they are useless. True or false, the attempt authoritatively to support them is usurpation."

The last class of controversies adverted to in the Discourse before us, were those occasioned by questions concerning the power of a church or parish to dismiss their minister. We

refer those, who are curious in these matters, to the very succinct and satisfactory account here given. It seems to us, that it is of no sort of consequence, in a practical view, whether a minister has any legal rights or not. If he have them, he cannot enforce them. And if he could, he ought not to wish to do so, since it can only be done at the sacrifice of those kindly feelings, and that mutual respect, without which his office must be as burthensome to himself, as it is useless to others.

"To apportion," as Dr. Bancroft observes, "the minister's compensation to his annual wants, on a declaration that this support will be continued through life, the parish taking the risk of sickness and infirmity, and refuse him a maintenance when providentially disenabled, all will acknowledge would be unjust. But no Congregational minister ever did, no one ever will, sustain himself in office by a legal process. . . . . Examine the history of ecclesiastical proceedings in this country, and it will be found, I believe, that in appeals to legal decisions, the people, without exception, have prevailed." And so, as we have said, they always will. A minister, who is wise, will find sooner or later, that the secret of his strength lies in an habitual consciousness of his weakness and dependence; will learn that no bond can be relied upon but the golden chain of mutual love; and will rest the adjudication of all his claims, in all respects, on that final tribunal where hearts come into judgment.

We come now to the second, and most interesting part of the Discourse before us, which relates to the Annals of the author's Parish. But as this interest is one of a local nature, we shall confine ourselves to some brief remarks on a few topics that may seem to have a peculiar claim to our notice. Of this description is the faithful but modest account the author gives of the efforts and sacrifices he was obliged to make in the earlier periods of his history. The religious society, with whose fortunes he has been, from the first and through the whole course of his ministry, associated, was composed of seceders from the first parish of the town of Worcester. "They consisted of sixty-seven men; most of whom were heads of families, and among them was a large proportion of the professional and distinguished men of the town, and a fair proportion of the farmers and mechanics."

Stated public worship was begun in March, 1785. A church was organized, and the pastor ordained in February, 1786.

The difficulties with which such little bands of Christians are obliged to meet, in asserting for themselves the rights of conscience, and in securing the preaching of what they deem a purer faith than the traditionary one of their fathers, are now no longer novelties in our religious annals. But the embarrassment and trials, to which this early association of Liberal Christians was exposed, are perhaps without a parallel in similar enterprises at a later day. We cannot, in the scanty limits to which we are restricted, so much as make a meagre summary of them. The seceders were not loved on account of their opinions. In the language of the late Lieutenant-Governor Lincoln, who advocated their claims for an act of incorporation before a committee of the Legislature, — "The majority of our inhabitants are rigid Calvinists, the petitioners are rank Arminians." Their experiment of a voluntary association for religious purposes was then new in the interior of the State, and was looked upon, and even by many wise and good men, as a dangerous innovation. The parent society, out of which these rebellious children came, was not a little irritated and overbearing. Its minister, the Rev. Mr. Austin, could not exchange with a brother of his own faith, because this said brother had offered a prayer in Mr. Bancroft's pulpit. The clergy of the county, with some few exceptions, were hostile. Great difficulties arose in procuring sufficient funds to sustain the new society. The period was extremely inauspicious to the effort. The Revolutionary war had just closed. Paper money became no money at all. The fruits and products of the earth were of little value as exchangeable commodities. Taxes were high, and creditors were importunate. Under this general pressure, it was deemed inexpedient to assess an annual sum upon the parish, and monthly contributions were resorted to. The minister was, afterwards, compelled to settle with the members of his society severally, when and how he could, — and why this alone did not break down his spirit, we cannot well understand. When a church was afterwards to be built, the experiment was thought to be too hazardous to be entered upon, unless the pastor would consent to relinquish one third of his legal salary, which, in the whole, was only five hundred dollars. This he complied with. And now, under the

pressure of all these adverse circumstances, what was the temper and bearing of our venerable friend, upon whom the pressure principally fell? Let him tell us:

"During these trying occurrences, I occasionally felt depression of spirits, and with difficulty could summon sufficient resolution to prosecute my professional labors. But I was firmly established in the belief, that the cause in which we were engaged was the cause of Christian truth, the cause of God, and I was unwilling to abandon it. I also knew that opponents were impatiently waiting for the prostration of a society which they deemed heretical; and shall I hesitate to confess, that I was unwilling to give them the triumph?

"My income from the parish being quite inadequate to the support of a family, I was obliged to have recourse to extraneous means. We for years received as many boarders as our house would accommodate. I assisted several youth in their preparation for college or qualifying themselves for useful stations in busy life; through a long period I admitted in the forenoons of week days a number of the daughters and relatives of parishioners into my study, and gave them the best instruction in my power. The publication of Washington's Life yielded some profit; during several years I officiated as editor of one or another of our public journals.

"At no period was I destitute of cheering, animating supports, as numbers of the most substantial members of the society proved steadfast in their purpose, and continued my unwavering friends; they were persevering in their efforts to sustain our cause, and afforded me all the advice and assistance in their power. Encouraging appearances of success were not wanting."— pp. 21, 22.

Indeed the society, as a body, always seem to have duly appreciated the value of this excellent man and exemplary minister. Its almost unbroken harmony during the long period of fifty years, — long indeed for the endurance of any human connexion, — and this, too, amidst such discouraging and perplexing circumstances is equally honorable to minister and people. In the earlier periods of their connexion, moreover, he was continually receiving presents of various kinds, according to the ability and circumstances of the donors, which, considered as expressions of their respect and regard, of course possessed a value a hundred-fold beyond their own. And during the continental war in Europe, when all the means of livelihood rose greatly in price, he was aided by

special grants, and subsequently, as the society increased in numbers and resources, additions to his salary were made.

Still his efforts and sacrifices during the greater part of his ministry must have been great and trying indeed. His fidelity to his religious principles, and the firmness and consistency with which he maintained them, exposed him to the suspicion, or ill-concealed odium, or, what is scarcely better, the constrained courtesies of a large part of those, whose Christian sympathy he felt he had a right to enjoy. The condition of his society seemed to be repeatedly in a precarious state. Add to this, his professional income was wholly inadequate to his support. He was debarred, both by a sense of propriety and by a just deference to popular opinion, from all subsidiary means of increasing it, except those few and scanty ones, which were not considered disreputable to his clerical profession, but which, nevertheless, must have been pursued at the expense of time and labor which he would gladly have devoted to his appropriate duties and studies as a clergyman. A large family was dependent upon his sole exertions. Year after year, though passed in earnest labor, and in the practice of the strictest economy, and with every species of self-denial and retrenchment that his character as a gentleman and the claims of Christian hospitality would permit, he found his resources more and more straitened. He and his, like others, were subjected to the calamity of sickness with all its additional demands on a narrow income. But it is absolutely painful for us to go into this detail. Enough has been said for those who have the hearts to interpret it; and we have no words that will reach those who have them not. We allude to these circumstances here, mainly for the purpose of paying our humble tribute of respect to the Christian heroism of this venerable man, who, through successive years, in Godly simplicity and Godly sincerity, cheerfully, consistently, honorably, pursued the path of duty, thorny and rugged as it was; always faithful at his post, always the fearless assertor and champion of what he deemed to be the truth; always sustained by the approbation of his conscience; always looking to God, his present witness and final judge, in a clear, settled, and filial trust. This *is* self-sacrifice indeed, and not its wordy semblance. And it seems to us there is more of a genuine spirit and steady manhood, more of truly high endeavour, more of really elevated sentiment in

this calm, earnest, unfaltering devotion to the humble duties of his place and station, than is required in a host of that vulgar race of heroes, whom the world delights to honor.

It is an inquiry upon which we have no inclination or space to dilate, but still one we cannot but think worthy of the attention of thoughtful and philanthropic men, whether this is an insulated case, whether such conflicts as these, for life, with a scanty and insufficient professional income, are peculiar to our venerable friend; and, — if it should be found on examination, that this is, by no means, the fact, but that there are many others suffering in silence and in hopelessness and from the same causes as he did, and that in consequence the moral and mental independence of clergymen is liable to be crippled, their efficiency impaired, their health shattered, and their lives, to a degree unexampled in any other class of men, prematurely closed,* — whether, if this be the real state of the case, to any considerable extent, it is not a subject worthy of the faithful and affectionate attention of serious and liberal-minded men. We are sufficiently apprized that

"Greatness and goodness are not means but ends,"

and require not to be informed, that all who preach the gospel need to be armed and inspired with a martyr's spirit; but still it seems to us a very grave inquiry, (leaving all individual cases out of the question, and disclaiming all personal references of every kind,) whether it is right, or wise, or expedient, or safe, to trust the supply of so great an interest of our religion as its preached word, to such an insecure tenure. Is there not great danger, moreover, in the state of things supposed, that we shall show to the myriads of observers on the other side of the Atlantic, who are looking to us with intense anxiety for a solution of the problem, — that the "Voluntary System," so called, as applied to the support of Religious Institutions, is a miserable failure?

To return from this slight digression, we are happy in congratulating the worthy subject of this notice, his more youthful associate, and the religious society with which they are connected, on the success that has attended their exertions for the

* See some facts on this subject stated in the "Christian Register," of March 12th, 1836.

common welfare. At the commencement of the senior pastor's ministry there was scarcely a minister or church in the County of Worcester, that would willingly hold any professional communion with him, or suffer him to preach within their precincts. Now, we are told, that there are twenty-one societies, within the same limits, which are avowedly Unitarian in their principles and forms; and that not an "inconsiderable number of these are among the most numerous and respectable in the county." And if we rightly read the signs of the times in this section of our land, as well as throughout New England generally, there is a great and constantly increasing number of thinking persons, who, while they are still ranked nominally in Orthodox societies, so called, are finding it more and more difficult to pronounce, articulately, the shibboleth of the sect.

This interesting and very characteristic Discourse is brought to a conclusion, by a train of pensive and solemn thought. "If," says the author, "the question of improvement has respect to the members of the society, who are the individuals to whom I can appeal? They, who with me began their course of Christian improvement, are removed from life; but one man remains, of those who invited me to settle with them as their minister; and but two women now live, who, at that time, were heads of a family. With one exception, I am the oldest man in the parish, and his connexion with us was but of yesterday. . . . . I have outlived my generation; and in the midst of society may be considered as a solitary man."

This is, indeed, an affecting example of the continually repeated lesson of the transitoriness of human relations, and the nothingness of human life. Fifty years ago he stood in the midst of a circle of nearly sixty families, most of whom were in early life. But he has lived to see one familiar face, after another, leave its accustomed spot in the house of God; and he has followed nearly six hundred persons of his religious fold to the "mightier congregation of the dead." But though he has "outlived his generation," let him not think that he is a "solitary man." Let him call to mind the sentiment ascribed to the elder Cato; — "Non cani, non rugæ, repente auctoritatem arripere possunt; sed honeste acta superior ætas fructus capit auctoritatis extremos. Hæc enim ipsa sunt honorabilia, quæ videntur levia atque communia, salutari,

appeti, decedi, assurgi, deduci, reduci, consuli." Let him feel, too, that he is held in respect and filial reverence by the children of his earlier associates and friends, and that, in the beautiful language of the Levitical law, they are all glad to "rise up before the hoary head, and to honor the face of the old man." J. B.

ART. VII. — *Miscellanies.* By HARRIET MARTINEAU. In Two Volumes. Boston: Hilliard, Gray, & Co. 1836. 12mo. pp. 352 and 402.

THEY, who have read Miss Martineau's "Illustrations of Political Economy," will recognise the aspect of her genius, as displayed in the present work, to be another and the same, — reminding us of a strong family likeness pervading countenances of different features, while each is stamped with its own individual expression. In her "Illustrations," she treats of man in his social relations, and traces the good or evil effects which spring from obedience to, or violation of, those laws of production, distribution, and consumption, upon which the physical well-being of communities, and the happiness of the individuals composing them (so far as happiness is affected by outward circumstances), depend. Certain political and economical problems are wrought out, in which men and women stand for the figures. Though, in the prosecution of her task, most vigorous, just, and beautiful delineations of character are presented to us, and we are brought to see the very pulses of the naked human heart throbbing with hope and fear, joy and despair,— to watch that great conflict in which, with victory inclining from one side to the other, the mind and soul of man are ever struggling with the events which are his training and discipline, yet this is something incidental,— the illustration strictly; while the thing illustrated is a truth depending upon those physical necessities which are common to the race, and upon those laws of demand and supply, which are as invariable and unalterable as the laws of natural science. But, in most of the articles composing the present collection, the writer's aim has been to treat of those influences, which operate upon man considered as an individual, which are the common heri-

tage of humanity, the lessons taught by God to all his children, and which, though they may be modified by the position in which we are placed in social life, do not grow out of or depend upon it. Her themes have principally been drawn from that class of truths, which would concern Robinson Crusoe in his lonely island, no less than the inhabitant of the most populous metropolis on the globe. The religious principle, in its various stages of growth, and as operating upon minds of different classes and of the same class with different degrees of advancement, is discussed and illustrated with a fulness and clearness, admirable in themselves, and in such a manner as cannot fail to afford great help to those who are in any of the transition-states described. The sources of moral power, and the means by which the moral nature may be elevated and strengthened, are pointed out with a distinctness, which will win her the gratitude of many, over whose souls the dark shadows of doubt and self-distrust are yet hanging. She would fain lead the human soul to those fountains at which alone its immortal thirst can be slaked, — arm the human mind with those truths which are its proper panoply, — and fill the human heart with those affections in which alone it can find repose.

But the points of resemblance between the "Miscellanies" and the "Illustrations" are many and striking. There are the same beauty and transparency of style, the same freshness and originality of thought, the same sympathy with the race in contradistinction to certain favored individuals or favored classes, the same want of reverence for forms and creeds and usages and opinions which a man practises and holds for no better reason than that his father practised and held them before him, the same disposition to question, examine, and take nothing for granted, the same healthy devotional spirit, the same sensibility to every thing morally beautiful and true, the same comprehensive charity, the same clear-sighted faith.

The two volumes before us contain a variety of miscellaneous articles, originally written as contributions to periodical works, during the years 1829–1832. Among them there is, of course, much diversity of style and character, as well as inequality of merit. No definite plan has been followed in their arrangement, which was intended solely for

convenience of reference. Miss Martineau, however, in her Preface (in itself a striking and valuable production, and by no means to be skipped over by the impatient reader,) has given us a sort of *catalogue raisonné* of the various articles, by the aid of which, they assume the semblance of a symmetrical and proportionate whole. The book should be read in connexion with the Preface, not only to do full justice to the writer, but for the sake of the greater benefit which the reader may thereby derive from it. The following paragraph presents us with the "presiding idea" of the whole work.

"On looking over these pieces, after an interval of four years, during which they were wholly forgotten, it is evident to me that one presiding idea must have been in my mind during the composition of the whole; dawning over the first, and brightening up to the last. One piece bears the name of 'The Progress of Worship.' This name might, with equal propriety, be given to the tale called Solitude and Society; to the parable of the Hermit who went out to his matins; to the verses headed The Three Ages of the Soul; and to the 2d No. of the Sabbath Musings: and I am finally tempted to give this title to the whole book. Its application, however, might not appear so clear to others as to myself; and I shall therefore confine myself to indicating it by a second classification in this Preface." — Vol. i. p. iii.

Miss Martineau then proceeds to define and describe the various stages of the religious sentiment, and points out the several articles appropriate to each stage as having been written in reference to it. We should be glad to extract largely from this portion of the Preface; but our limits will not allow us to take the whole, and, justice to the writer forbidding us to dissever a part from its connexion with the remainder, we must content ourselves with the following paragraph at the close.

"I am far from imagining that there is any thing new or peculiar in this idea of the progress of worship: but, though it may be found traced out in every page of the Gospel, and wrought out in the lives of the noblest of heathens before, and the wisest of Christians since its date, it can hardly be said to be sufficiently familiar to us as long as we see religion treated as a concern apart from all other concerns; waited for, as for a morning and evening breeze, instead of being unconsciously breathed, as the element by which we live. It cannot be said to be sufficiently fa-

miliar to us, as long as any intend to be men of business in the prime of life, and Christians some time or other. It cannot be said to be sufficiently familiar to us, while any of us are supine under the abuses of society, or terrified at the march of events, or paralyzed by human opinion, or falling short in any way in those duties in which religious sentiment is designed to be a sufficient stimulus and support. Indifference in such duties is a sufficient proof that our religion has not engaged our human affections; that our worship, if we worship, has not advanced beyond the second stage of its progress." — Vol. I. p. ix.

The most obvious characteristic of this work, and that which strikes the most superficial reader at a glance, is the extensive range of its subjects, and the various forms in which the mind of the writer addresses that of the reader. Almost every sort of intellectual taste can here find its congenial food. There is the milk of narrative and parables for babes, and the strong meat of metaphysics and philosophy for men. Religion is here elevated to meet the wants of the doubting and questioning sage, and there brought down to the comprehension of the child, who, with clásped hands at his mother's knee, seeks to give utterance to the dawning sentiment of worship. In one place, we behold the stream of devotional feeling gushing warm from the heart of faith, and, in another, the spirit of examination and inquiry is pushed to a degree of boldness which will alarm some "weak brethren." Poetry and prose, tales and reviews, literary criticism, philosophical essays, metaphysical analysis, and theological speculation alternate with each other, and present their various attractions to various tastes; and yet there is a certain unity in the midst of all this diversity. Each production has the strong stamp of individuality. In whatever form she is presenting her thoughts, and whatever class of minds she is addressing, we can perceive that the same interests are uppermost with her, and she is not losing sight of that vocation to which, as a writer and thinker, she has been called. There is nothing of the tame formality of imitation, or of that coldness which springs from the same interest, or rather the same want of interest, in every thing; but there is the warm flush of sympathy on every page, and every sentence comes fresh and sparkling from the fountains of the heart. Her views and opinions are entirely her own, and have not been borrowed or taken upon trust. Whatever may be thought of their sound-

ness or correctness, their originality cannot be denied. However much a man may differ from her, he cannot say that these are not her own convictions, to which she has come by a process in which her mind has acted for itself and gone alone, whether its direction be right or wrong. The want of what is called learning is very obvious, and it is not easy to find a person, at the present day, when the temptation to over-read is so strong, who has thought and observed so much and read so little. Few of her intellectual resources have been supplied from books, and allusions and illustrations drawn from literature and literary history are very rare in comparison with those which come from actual observation of the two great worlds of sense and spirit. Where so vigorous and healthy a mind is left to develope itself after its own fashion, there results not only an originality in its thoughts themselves, but in the very garb in which they are clothed. The style of these articles has nothing of that formal cut so often observable in literary hacks who have served a regular apprenticeship to books, but it seems to be so appropriate to the matter that we can hardly conceive of its being presented to us in any other form.

It forms no part of our plan to pass a particular criticism upon each article in these volumes, or to express our assent to the many points in which we should agree with her, and our dissent from those few in which we might be inclined to differ from her. Of the work as a whole, we entertain a high estimation, and we are confident that it is not of that brood which "die and make no sign," but that it is destined to exercise an important and a deep, if not wide, influence. That it should become popular is not to be expected, since there is nothing, either in its matter or manner, to attract those who read merely for the sake of reading; it will find "fit audience though few." The timid will gain courage, and the distrustful, confidence, from its pages. It will be read in solitude with eyes blinded with joyful tears at having found sympathy for the first time within its mute leaves. It is a book which will help those, who are struggling to gain a victory over themselves and to convert their very infirmities into wings. The young, who are in that state of doubtful unrest which characterizes the early stages in the growth of the religious principle, when every thing seems mysterious, and, most of all, the waywardness and apathy of one's own

spirit, will here see the gleam of hope and hear the voice of consolation.

Among the readers of these volumes there will be, of course, a diversity of opinion as to the relative merit of the various articles composing them, each judging according to his own taste. Some of the reviews are full of thought and, as intellectual efforts, inferior to no portion of the work, though they will probably be the least generally read. Those of the "Essays on the Pursuit of Truth," of "Crombie's Natural Theology," and "Lessing's Hundred Thoughts," are conspicuous for their ability. In the first of these, Hume's argument against miracles is examined with great fairness and great acuteness. The general reader will find the essay on the "Characteristics of the Genius of Scott" among the most attractive, if not the most so, of all the articles, not only from its subject, but from the manner of treating it. It shows how much interest may be given to the most hackneyed theme by looking at it from a new point of view, and by transcribing the results of that observation, rather than by saying over again in new and finer language, what in substance had often been said before. It will be a question with many, whether she has not exaggerated Scott's ignorance of the humbler classes, no less than his want of sympathy with them, and whether she has not overlooked the dangers of so desultory an education as his was. We cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of quoting some of her eloquent and striking remarks on the female characters of Sir Walter Scott, though over some of her views, as here expressed, not a few heads will be doubtfully shaken.

"Much has Walter Scott also done, and done it also unconsciously, for woman. Neither Mary Wollstonecraft, nor Thompson of Cork, nor any other advocate of the rights of woman, has pleaded so eloquently to the thoughtful, — and the thoughtful alone will entertain the subject, — as Walter Scott, by his exhibition of what women are, and by two or three indications of what they might be. He has been found fault with for the poverty of character of the women of his tales; a species of blame against which we have always protested. If he had made as long a list of oddities among his women as his men, he would have exposed himself to the reproach of quitting nature, and deserting classes for extravagant individualities; since there is much less scope for eccentricity among women, in the present state of society, than among men. But, it is alleged, he has made few of his female charac-

ters representatives of a class. True; for the plain reason that there are scarcely any classes to represent. We thank him for the forcible exhibition of this truth: we thank him for the very term *womankind*; and can well bear its insulting use in the mouth of the scoffer, for the sake of the process it may set to work in the mind of the meditative and the just. There is no saying what the common use of the term *canaille* may in time be proved to have effected for the lower orders of men; or in what degree the process of female emancipation may be hastened by the slang use of the term *womankind*, by despots and by fools. It may lead some watchful intellects, — some feeling hearts, — to ponder the reasons of the fact, that the word *mankind* calls up associations of grandeur and variety, — that of *womankind*, ideas of littleness and sameness; — that the one brings after it conceptions of lofty destiny, heroic action, grave counsel, a busy office in society, a dignified repose from its cares, a steadfast pursuit of wisdom, an intrepid achievement of good; — while the other originates the very opposite conceptions, — vegetation instead of life, folly instead of counsel, frivolity instead of action, restlessness in the place of industry, apathy in that of repose, listless accomplishment of small aims, a passive reception of what others may please to impart; or, at the very best, a halting, intermitting pursuit of dimly discerned objects. To some it may be suggested to inquire, why this contrast should exist; — why one half of the rational creation should be so very much less rational, — and, as a consequence, so much less good, and so much less happy, than the other. If they are for a moment led by custom to doubt whether, because they are less rational, they are less happy and less good, the slightest recurrence to Scott's novels is enough to satisfy them, that the common notion of the sufficiency of present female objects to female progression and happiness is unfounded. They will perhaps look abroad from Scott into all other works of fiction, — into all faithful pictures of life, — and see what women are; and they will finally perceive, that the fewer women there are found to plead the cause of their sex, the larger mixture of folly there is in their pleadings; the more extensive their own unconsciousness of their wrongs, the stronger is their case. The best argument for Negro Emancipation lies in the vices and subservience of slaves: the best argument for female emancipation lies in the folly and contentedness of women under the present system, — an argument to which Walter Scott has done the fullest justice; for a set of more passionless, frivolous, uninteresting beings was never assembled at morning auction, or evening tea-table, than he has presented us with in his novels. The few exceptions are made so by the strong workings of instinct, or of superstition (the offspring of strong instinct and weak

reason combined); save in the two or three instances where the female mind had been exposed to manly discipline. Scott's female characters are easily arranged under these divisions: — Three-fourths are *womankind* merely; pretty, insignificant ladies, with their pert waiting maids. A few are viragoes, in whom instinct is strong, whose souls are to migrate hereafter into the she-eagle or bear, — Helen M'Gregor, Ulrica, Magdalen Græme, and the Highland Mother. A few are superstitious, — Elspeth, Alice, Norna, Mother Nicneven. A few exhibit the same tendencies, modified by some one passion; as Lady Ashton, Lady Derby, and Lady Douglas. Mary and Elizabeth are womankind modified by royalty. There only remain Flora M'Ivor, Die Vernon, Rebecca, and Jeanie Deans. For these four, and their glorious significance, womankind are as much obliged to Walter Scott as for the insignificance of all the rest; not because they are what women might be, and therefore ought to be; but because they afford indications of this, and that these indications are owing to their having escaped from the management of man, and been trained by the discipline of circumstance. If common methods yield no such women as these, if such women occasionally come forth from the school of experience, what an argument is this against the common methods, — what a plea in favor of a change of system! Woman cannot be too grateful to him who has furnished it. Henceforth, when men fire at the name of Flora M'Ivor, let women say, "There will be more Floras when women feel that they have political power and duties." When men worship the image of Die Vernon, let them be reminded, that there will be other Die Vernons when women are impelled to self-reliance. When Jeanie is spoken of with tender esteem, let it be suggested, that strength of motive makes heroism of action; and that as long as motive is confined and weakened, the very activity which should accomplish high aims must degenerate into pure restlessness. When Rebecca is sighed for, as a lofty presence that has passed away, it should be asked, how she should possibly remain or reappear in a society, which alike denies the discipline by which her high powers and sensibilities might be matured, and the objects on which they might be worthily employed. As a woman no less than as a Jewess, she is the representative of the wrongs of a degraded and despised class; there is no abiding-place for her among foes to her caste; she wanders unemployed (as regards her peculiar capabilities) through the world; and when she dies, there has been, not only a deep injury inflicted, but a waste made of the resources of human greatness and happiness. Yes, women may choose Rebecca as the representative of their capabilities: first, despised, then wondered at, and involuntarily admired; tempted, made use of, then persecuted, and finally banished —

not by a formal decree, but by being refused honorable occupation, and a safe abiding-place. Let women not only take her for their model, but make her speak for them to society, till they have obtained the educational discipline which beseems them; the rights, political and social, which are their due; and that equal regard with the other sex in the eye of man, which it requires the faith of Rebecca to assure them they have in the eye of Heaven." — Vol. I. pp. 46 – 50.

The "Sabbath Musings" are full of beauty and originality. They are vivid transcripts of a state of devotional feeling, tinctured neither with extravagance, bigotry, nor spiritual pride. They are as natural, as they are impressive. We have never met with any thing before, which resembled them very nearly. They breathe that healthy fervor, which is the unerring index of true religion, and, under the guise of emotions spontaneously bubbling up, contain important revelations of the manner, in which religion ought to mingle with every enjoyment of the taste, every aspiration of the soul, every effort of the understanding, and every impulse of the affections. To recommend them warmly to those who value religion and who have felt it, like sunshine, passing into their souls, would be superfluous; for such cannot fail to recognise in them, in a more beautiful aspect, the image of what they themselves have felt and thought.

The "Letter to the Deaf" is an admirable production, conveying important moral instruction, not only to those to whom it is addressed, but to all who are desirous of ruling their own murmuring spirits, and of gaining, through moral conflict and victory, that peace which the world can neither give nor take away.

The essay "On Moral Independence" is, however, that part of the book, for which we feel most grateful to her, and which we should be least willing to lose. To one who had never read this essay, it would seem as if the subject had long ago been exhausted, and that all, which could be said about it, was already familiar to the minds of reading and thinking men; but the first two or three paragraphs are sufficient to show us, that here the whole thing is put in a new light and made to rest upon a new foundation. Not only is the duty of moral independence made perfectly clear, — that it always was, — but we are made to wonder and be ashamed that any thing

could have interfered between the conviction of the duty and the carrying out that conviction in daily and hourly conduct. The mountain-wind does not more surely brace the languid frame, than does this essay the feeble will. It is entirely free from declamatory extravagance, and states and argues the question with that serene calmness which is essential to true strength. She writes as one who has long since gained that elevation to which she is inviting others to climb, without having forgotten the toils of the ascent. We are induced to value this essay so highly, not only on account of its great intrinsic merits, but because it teaches a lesson of which our community stands in need. Moral Independence is too rare with us. We are too much slaves to one another. Public opinion is a sterner despot than ever Tiberius was. By its pressure, the weak are crushed into despair and the bold are irritated into madness. The least common of spectacles is that of a human being, asserting his divine prerogative of taking counsel of his own spirit, and calmly smiling at the bristling front of opposition he may encounter. We want men who have courage to stand alone,—not men of stone, moral petrifactions,—but men with heads to think and hearts to feel, and who, though yearning for sympathy, will consent to dwell apart, the very Parias of social life, rather than barter away their birthright of freedom. We cannot doubt that this essay will help to increase the number of such, and that many will have a new heart of courage put into them by it, which will enable them to brave the loudest storm of opinion that ever blew, if the voice of duty and their own conscience bid them.

We like this work for its honesty and its boldness. Many will lament that she did not suppress such portions of it as are strongly tinged with materialism (which tendency in her mind, we would remark, seems strangely inconsistent with the spirituality of her views of religion); and so should we, did we think that the interests of truth were best promoted by silencing the voice of opposition. Miss Martineau is a bold and consistent, but not a reckless, reformer. She can give a reason for every article of the faith that is in her. No fair-minded person can help admiring the manner in which she asserts and maintains her views, whether he may think those views right or wrong. There is no holding back, no reservation, no cautious qualification, no paring down and

clipping till all sharpness and prominence are lost; she speaks out her mind, and her whole mind, freely and fully, but with great candor and great fairness. There is no sophistry, no appeal to vulgar passions or vulgar prejudices, no contemptuous ridicule of what is too strong to be assailed by argument, on shuffling out of sight the true point at issue, no escaping from a doubtful conflict under a cloud of words. Though it may seem a singular epithet to apply to a work written by a woman, we have been constantly struck with its *manliness*. In using this word, we would not be understood as saying that it is not a truly feminine production, for it is eminently so; but it has that combination of strength, elevation, and dignity which seems to be implied in that expression. We shall look in vain in it for mawkish sentimentality, or sickly refinement, or feeble verbiage, or overstrained enthusiasm. Its tone is uniformly healthy, bespeaking a sound mind and a robust moral constitution.

There is a valuable truth taught, rather incidentally than directly, in these volumes; and that is, that the sense of the beautiful is the common heritage of humanity, and that there is something wrong in the constitution of that society in which any class is forbidden a participation in the pleasures of taste. The perfect compatibility of these pleasures with constant devotion to duty, even in its coarsest and most repulsive forms, is also insisted upon. These are important truths, though apt to be overlooked, even by philanthropists. We believe, that any system of education for the many will be imperfect, which does not include the cultivation of the taste; and that it is the duty of patriots and legislators, as well as Christians, to provide for the gratification of that faculty. That men will thereby become restless, envious, and dissatisfied with their condition, is a notion, as it seems to us, resting upon a superficial knowledge of the elements of humanity. In the following paragraph from the fourth number of the "Sabbath Musings," Miss Martineau expresses herself directly upon the subject, and her views do not appear to us to be visionary or impracticable.

"What an abode it is! If I did not know it to have been prepared for the luxury of those who seek the pleasures of nature in company, I should have imagined it built for the retreat of the philosopher. If I did not know it to be the charge of a peasant's

family, I should have looked for an inhabitant of a different class, — for a world-wearied or nature-loving recluse. How its bold front springs abruptly from the rock, while its projecting thatch is made to send the summer rain pattering among the pebbles far below! How snugly is it sheltered by the larch-plantation on either side, and its wall-flowers — is there any other place where they grow so abundantly? The rock is tufted with them in every crevice; they spring from every ledge, and fringe every projection. And what are the dwellers in this summer-house? The wood-ranger, and his wife and babe. They look happy, but they are heedless of what is before their eyes. They have possessed themselves of the best window, as if it were their Sunday privilege to monopolize the pleasures which their superiors eagerly seek on every other day. But what avails their privileged seat to them? That man's brow is such as should betoken high capabilities; yet, with this scene before him, he amuses himself with provoking the bayings of his mastiff. What mother, with her infant in her lap, can be insensible to maternal cares? Yet there is one who heeds not her babe, and who has no such intelligence in her wandering gaze as might account for the neglect. Why should not these, pupils, like the wise, of nature and of man, bred up, like the wise, in the knowledge of the gospel, feel the full beauty and solemnity of a scene like this? Nature has been ready to do her part; the gospel can never fail; it is man who has stinted what he ought to have cherished, and perverted the energies which it was his office to control. It is through evil social influences, that the eyes of such as these are turned from beholding the stars when, as now, they first glimmer through the twilight, and that their ears are closed to the soothing tones of the night winds, as they come hither from their rovings over land and sea." — Vol. I. pp. 152, 153.

We feel under obligations, also, to Miss Martineau for her views of religion and of the nature and operations of the religious sentiment. They are such as are well calculated to meet the wants of the time. The age is carrying its practical, inquisitive, and investigating spirit into religious matters, and searching into the *why* and the *wherefore* of what has long been taken upon trust. Men are no longer to be influenced by such a form of religion, as would satisfy a Simon Stylites or any other devout lunatic, nor will they mistake an excitement of the nervous system for the inspiration of Heaven. The divine right of priests is as little respected, as the divine right of kings. It will no longer do, to tell a man that religion

is necessary to him, and, at the same time, present him with a set of doctrines which his reason compels him to reject. It is idle to inveigh against this spirit and call it hard names; for, whether right or wrong, it has passed into men's minds, and neither "bell, book, nor candle" will drive it thence. The religion, which the age demands, is one which will satisfy the understanding while it melts the heart, which is consistent with itself, which is overlaid with no "strange inventions" of man's devising, which recognises the elementary principles of humanity, and whose pure essence has not been smirched and soiled by the base hands of superstition, bigotry, and intolerance. Such is the aspect of religion, as it is presented to us in these volumes. Miss Martineau sifts, examines, and weighs, but she firmly believes and reverently worships. The inquisitive understanding is united with the glow of devotion, in such a manner as might be supposed to result from the combination of Priestley with Doddridge. In the formation of her creed she unhesitatingly rejects whatever she deems inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity, by however great names it may have been sanctioned; but no nun ever clasped her crucifix to her heart with more devout sensibility, than she does the faith which her reason has told her is the true one. Recognising fully the existence of the instinct of religion, and that the soul of man hungers and thirsts for it and has but an imperfect life without it, she still perceives, that he craves a religion which he can understand as well as feel, — that the philosopher demands a faith which he may try in the crucible of his reason, like the science which he investigates, and that the laborer seeks an interpretation of the mysterious feeling which drops into his heart from the silent stars, as he walks home beneath their eyes. Her religion is not a cold system of negations which chills the heart of devotion, but it is full of warm life, and instinct with a life-giving principle. No one, who has watched the signs of the times, can doubt that religion, presented in such a shape, will be welcomed by many who have hitherto rejected, or been indifferent to it.

We take leave of Miss Martineau with grateful acknowledgments for the pleasure and instruction we have derived from this work. She says, in the conclusion of her Preface, "It gives me much pleasure to prepare for my American friends, at the suggestion of some beloved ones among them, a book in which they may read, with the eyes of their consciousness,

invisible records of the gratitude and love of a stranger, whom they have gladdened by their hospitality and honored with their friendship." Her "American friends" will cordially respond to these expressions of attachment and good will. She has helped us by her presence, as well as by her writings; and many will remember her visit, as an era in the growth of their minds and characters. Her image will be fondly cherished in many a heart, where admiration for the writer is swallowed up in gratitude to the woman. Her vocation is no common one, and, much as she has yet done for her race, we have a confident expectation that she will do more. Her

> "godlike aim is to make less
> The sum of human wretchedness,
> And strengthen man with his own mind."

Her field is the world, and there are but few reapers to the harvest into which she has thrust her sickle. There are abuses in the best social system, yet to be removed; dark places to be enlightened, and crooked ones to be made straight. Errors, which have long struck their roots into the soil of the general mind, and resisted for centuries the strong winds of truth, are yet to be torn up. Moral and intellectual wastes are to be made to blossom, like the rose. The heart of man is yet hardened against his brother man, and misfortune is made to suffer the penalty of crime. It must be required of rulers and statesmen and legislators to act from a far higher set of principles, and to walk by a light from heaven, and not by the dim sparks of expediency and self-interest. The day is short, and the night cometh, in which no man can work. Obloquy and abuse and misrepresentation she must expect; they are the bitter ingredients in the cup, which every reformer must drink. This is the same world which stoned the prophets and burned the martyrs; and, though it is now esteemed bad taste to put men and women into the fire for their opinions' sake, the intolerance which kindled the flames of Smithfield still exists, though in a different form. But let her not faint or despair. Good wishes will go with her, and effectual, fervent prayers encompass her; and, though these should fail, there are the "three fast friends" which will not forsake the upright,

> "Himself, his Maker, and the Angel Death."

G. S. H.

Art. VIII. — *A Narrative of a Visit to England.* By John Codman, D. D., One of the Deputation from the General Association of Massachusetts to the Congregational Union of England and Wales. Boston: Perkins and Marvin. 1836. 16mo. pp. 248.

The Narrative of the Visit to the American Churches by the English Deputation, composed of Drs. Reed and Matheson, went very fully into a discussion of local topics, with which the travellers, of course, were but imperfectly acquainted, and consequently fell into not a few ludicrous blunders. But their testimony, and even their speculations, were interesting and valuable on many accounts. Dr. Codman, warned as it would seem by their example of the danger of pronouncing judgment on the customs, and institutions, and parties of a foreign country, is not likely to give much offence anywhere in this way; but his inoffensiveness is purchased at too great a sacrifice. By confining himself almost wholly to the dry details of his journey, and barren generalities, and compliments more kind than discriminating, he has made his book as unsatisfactory as it well could be, coming as it does from a gentleman and writer of so much respectability. And yet in one respect it gives us a good deal more than the title-page promises; for we have here a narrative of a Visit not to England alone, but to Italy, Switzerland, and France, and of a flying excursion to Scotland and Wales, not originally included, we suppose, in the purview of the Delegation.

From Dr. Codman's statements we should infer that Unitarianism, under its different forms, is more prevalent among the French Protestants than we had supposed. Thus he says:

"We spent a few days in Marseilles, where we experienced much kindnesss and hospitality from several friends, to whom we brought letters of introduction. In this important French port, there is but one Protestant church, and that is supplied by three pastors, and has but one service on the Sabbath, and a catechetical lecture during the week. The doctrinal sentiments of the pastors, like those of many of the Protestant clergy in France and Switzerland, are Arian." — pp. 18, 19.

Again he says:

"A ride of two or three days, during which nothing occurred of peculiar interest, brought us to Lyons, the second city in importance in France, and distinguished for its manufacturing relations to our own country. We had letters of introduction to the Rev. Adolphus Monód, an Evangelical Protestant clergyman, who, on account of his attachment to the distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel, had been excluded from one of the churches in that city, and was now preaching to a small congregation of pious and devoted friends of truth." — pp. 17, 18.

Of the state of opinion in the French capital the accounts are equally encouraging, due allowances being made for his way of telling the story.

"The Protestants in Paris are not without their attractive preacher. They have two congregations, connected with the Protestant National church, one very large in the Rue St. Honoré, and a smaller one in the Rue St. Antoine. These churches are supplied by four pastors, who preach in rotation. One of them, Mr. Monód, Jr., is decidedly Evangelical, while his father, and the other two pastors, are supposed to be inclining to Arianism, if not to Socinianism. One of these, the Rev. Mr. Coqueril, who is the most decided Unitarian, is a man of very superior talents, and a most eloquent declaimer. When he preaches, the church is always crowded with a gay and fashionable congregation." — pp. 66, 67.

Dr. Codman reached London in season to attend the anniversaries of the religious and benevolent institutions in that metropolis in the month of May, in fulfilment of the various commissions which he had received from similar institutions in this country. The reception which he and his co-delegate, Dr. Spring, met with from one of these associations, the Church Missionary Society, was such as to give just offence.

"We were told by some of our Dissenting brethren, that we should not be invited to speak at this meeting, as we were not *churchmen*; but we could not believe it, as, whatever might be the prejudices existing in this Society against Dissenters from the Established Church in England, we imagined that they could not extend to the Presbyterian and Congregational churches of our own country, much less to regularly commissioned delegates from the American Board. *But it was even so.* Our commissions were read in the committee room, but no other notice of us, or of the Society we had the honor to represent. We were suffered to

sit in silence on the platform, and to listen to several addresses from Noblemen, and Bishops, and other dignitaries of the Church of England." — p. 84.

We are surprised and grieved to find how little interest is taken in the Temperance reformation by that portion of the English Dissenters especially, with whom Dr. Codman had most to do.

"There is a strange apathy on this subject among our Dissenting brethren. Very few of them appear to be connected with Temperance societies themselves, or to encourage them in their congregations. The British and Foreign Temperance Society, which I shall have occasion to mention more particularly in another place, appears to be supported principally by members of the Established Church, and by the Society of *Friends*. At the anniversary of the Society, where Christians of all denominations ought to be found, I saw but one or two of those excellent Dissenting ministers whom it was my privilege to meet at the Congregational Union and on other occasions." — pp. 101, 102.

It cannot be, one would suppose, from a belief that there is no call for extraordinary efforts in this cause; for, in speaking of the far-famed "gin palaces" of London, our author says:

"We were told by a friend, who stood on a Sabbath morning opposite one of these receptacles of sin and misery, watching the ingress and egress of its visitors, that he counted fifty persons, in one minute, coming out of the place, having taken their morning dram; and by another, that not less than fifty pounds sterling are sometimes taken on a Sabbath morning in one of these haunts of vice and misery, in sums not exceeding a penny. Among all the dreadful instances of intemperance that were too common in our own country, previous to the temperance reformation, nothing I think could compare with statements like these.

"I could not but be struck with the amazing difference in the habits of temperance, between those parts of the Continent which I visited during the last winter, and the British Isles. It was so rare an occurrence to meet with an instance of intoxication in the streets and roads, through which we passed in France and Italy, that I have not, at the present moment, a distinct recollection of a single individual case; whereas I cannot number the instances of beastly intemperance I met with in the streets of London, and in different parts of the United Kingdom." — pp. 140, 141.

A custom is also mentioned by him as prevalent at their public anniversary meetings, which for its bearings on this sub-

ject is not very creditable to those by whom it is countenanced and defended. On a table on the platform are placed decanters of wine, large glasses of which are handed to the speakers and others, sometimes, though not always, diluted with water. After this, many of our readers will not be surprised to learn that occurrences of a still more questionable character take place occasionally on these same platforms. Our traveller was present at the meeting of the London Missionary Society, where a subscription was opened on the spot for a special effort, and about five hundred pounds sterling collected, "some in gold, some in bank notes, and more in promissory payments on scraps of paper, handed up on the platform, with the amount subscribed, prefixed with the three vowels, i. o. u. (*I owe you,*) and endorsed with the name of the subscriber." The sequel is thus given.

"While the audience were uniting in singing the doxology, at the close of the exercises, some one, who had contrived to gain admission to the platform in the disguise of a gentleman, availed himself of the opportunity, while the backs of the secretaries were turned upon the table, upon which stood the bag, containing the amount collected, to appropriate it to his own private use. The robbery was not discovered until after the assembly had separated. It proved to be less considerable than was at first apprehended, as a greater part of the amount was in notes of i. o. u., which were faithfully redeemed, and in some instances paid with more than compound interest in an increased subscription. The ultimate loss, sustained by the Society, did not exceed thirty or forty pounds." — pp. 110, 111.

Dr. Codman's official relations, and his position in society, afforded him peculiar opportunities for becoming acquainted with the Orthodox divines of England and Scotland; but his notions of propriety, or other reasons, have prevented him from allowing his countrymen to profit much by the advantage. Of Dr. Chalmers, however, he says, in speaking of an interview he had with him at the house of a mutual friend:

"Much conversation ensued on the subject of the expediency of church establishments, and the inefficacy of the voluntary principle. Although I could not agree with the Doctor and his friends in their views on this subject, I was gratified in hearing what could be said in favor of the dependence of the church upon civil aid, by the most powerful and eloquent champion of this side of the question now on the stage.

"The health of Dr. Chalmers is by no means good, and he has not attempted to preach for several months. It would not be surprising if the excitement, superinduced by the agitating controversy in which he has taken such a leading and active part, should have tended to impair his physical constitution. The course which he has adopted, although, I doubt not, from the very best and most conscientious motives, (for he is utterly incapable of any other,) while it has strengthened the hands of a party, who are far from appreciating his piety and evangelical zeal, has disappointed and grieved many of the friends of religious liberty, who love him for his attachment to the doctrines of grace, and admire the talent and eloquence with which he has so nobly defended them."— pp. 211, 212.

It is but justice to add, that, notwithstanding our disappointment in other respects, we honor the scrupulous care with which Dr. Codman has forborne to thrust the private matters of other people before the public. We still entertain the opinion that there is much in the public character of eminent individuals, and in the ever-varying phases of sects and parties, to supply legitimate topics, on which the traveller, if he writes at all, may be fairly expected to give the public some new and valuable information. But, if we cannot have this without the flippancy, the retailing of idle gossip and of conversations never intended for the public ear, or those more serious betrayals of confidence which so frequently occur in the writings of modern tourists, give us in preference the cautious and well-bred reserve of our author, though it leaves him but little to tell which every body did not know before. Ed.

NOTICES AND INTELLIGENCE.

The Works of William Ellery Channing, D. D. Glasgow: James Hedderwick & Son. 1835. 2 Vols. 16mo. pp. 466 and 500. — We hardly know in what terms to speak of this edition of Dr. Channing's writings, the second which has appeared in Great Britain. Of the publishers and their objects all our information is gathered from the short Advertisement prefixed to the first volume; from which it would appear that they yield to none in their admiration of the genius and character of the "great American classic," and that their principal motive in sending this edition to press was "to extend the range of his usefulness by

assisting to send his works through society in a form, cheap, and adapted to the present habits of the reading world." With these feelings and views we are a little surprised, that, so far as Dr. Channing's earlier writings are concerned, they have not confined themselves to the collection made and sanctioned by himself, in 1830; especially as in the Preface to that volume he expresses the wish in so many words, that none of his former publications, omitted therein for reasons which he assigns, might ever be found in their present form in any subsequent collection of his works. Our surprise, moreover, is changed into something very like indignation, on finding that, not content with undertaking to make a compilation of their own on principles in direct contradiction of the author's known wishes, they have not thought it worth while to consult him, or communicate with him in any way on the subject, but have chosen rather to be guided by report in the delicate matter of determining the authorship of anonymous compositions. The consequence is, as might have been expected, that one of the longest pieces in these volumes, entitled "Remarks on Associations formed by the Working Classes of America," we have the best authority for saying, was never seen or heard of by Dr. Channing, until to his astonishment he found it inserted here as a production of his own. This is too bad. Besides, the publishers have not only inserted what Dr. Channing never wrote, but have left out several of his later pieces, which he would doubtless introduce into a new and complete edition of his works; so that the Glasgow edition, instead of being, as it is called in the Advertisement, "the only complete one which has yet been published," is in every view singularly defective. We are grateful for every effort that is made to give a wider circulation to writings, which the publishers cannot appreciate more highly than we do; but no such plea can avail in justification of so flagrant a violation of what is due, not merely as matter of courtesy, but of justice, to the author himself, as we have here had occasion to expose.

A Harmony or Synoptical Arrangement of the Gospels: founded upon the most ancient Opinion respecting the Duration of our Saviour's Ministry, and exhibiting the Succession of Events in close Accordance with the Order of the two Apostolical Evangelists. With Dissertations, Notes, and Tables. By Lant Carpenter, LL. D., Minister of the Gospel. Bristol, (England.) 1835. 8vo. pp. cxlvii. and 322. — Dr. Carpenter's long-expected "Harmony" has appeared at last, and promises to be a valuable accession to the theological literature in our language. It has evidently been drawn up with much labor and care, and the arrangement of the text, and the mechanical execution generally, are satisfactory in a high

degree. Four Dissertations are prefixed: the first, "On the Duration of our Lord's Ministry"; the second, "On the Structure of the First Three Gospels in relation to the Succession of Events in our Lord's Ministry"; the third, "On the Political and Geographical State of Palestine at the Period of our Lord's Ministry"; and the fourth, "On the Succession of Events recorded in the Gospels, giving an Outline View of our Lord's Ministry." Dr. Carpenter's "Plan," as most of our readers are aware, is the same substantially with that adopted by Dr. Palfrey in the Harmony published by him at Boston, in 1831; but it is more fully carried out and defended, and the text, which is the Common Version, has been subjected to a more thorough revision and correction. He proceeds on what he terms the *bipaschal* system, making the public ministry of Christ to include but two passovers, and to last but little more than one year. Of his success in this attempt at a proper arrangement and collocation of the sacred narratives, he thus speaks in his Fourth Dissertation:

"Since the time when, by the consideration of the phenomena in the case, I came to the general conclusion which I still maintain, and this is now thirty years ago, — I have earnestly and I think faithfully reviewed them more than twice that number of times; I have sought for information on connected subjects wherever it appeared likely to be found; I have constructed Tables, and Monotessarons, and Outline Views, upon the whole, or on particular parts, and thus brought the Arrangement to a strict test; and, several years ago, I prepared a regular Harmony agreeably to it, which I have repeatedly considered. I can now trace every part of the eventful year of our Saviour's ministry, as far as we have records of it, with the sentiment which arises from the perception of distinctness and consistency. And to those who may not feel the same satisfaction, and who regard the whole as more the matter of conjecture than I can regard it, I would say, — If, nevertheless, this Arrangement appear to be attended with fewer difficulties than others are, and with more accordance with probability, adopt it, with what improvements you discover, — as loosely as you deem the nature and the degree of the evidence to require, yet steadily; and by degrees you will be able to follow the great events recorded, in a regular succession, like the events of ordinary life, and will find the reality of all become increasingly the object of vivid conception and faith."

The completion of this work, Dr. Carpenter tells us, will enable him to proceed with others which have been postponed to it. "Of these," he says, "the first will probably be a *Monotessaron* for the use of the young and uninformed. At some future period I hope to publish a similar work, for more general use, with explanatory observations and practical reflections." Of the book now under notice he informs us in the same Advertisement, that "the whole of the present impression, consisting of five hundred copies, is re-

quired for subscribers to the work, — though I must reserve a few, to be submitted to the examination of some able critics in this country, out of my own religious connexion, and of some of my brethren in Boston." Our only object here has been to announce the publication of the volume and its contents, intending on some future occasion to go more fully into an examination of its critical merits.

Religious Consolation. — Boston: Joseph Dowe. 1836. 16mo. pp. xxiv, and 227. — We have here a sort of book of which it is hardly possible to have too many; — a well selected and well printed collection of pieces in prose and verse, intended particularly for persons in affliction. The Introduction, on "Christian Faith," the only part of the volume which is original, is a valuable contribution by the compiler, Mr. Gannett of Boston, in which he speaks as follows of the object and authorship of the rest of the articles.

"They contain selections from English and American writers whose names are familiar in this community, — Price, Cappe, Channing, Dewey, Palfrey, Parker, Colman, and others. Many of the pieces here printed will be recognised as of recent publication. The idea of preparing the present volume arose out of the belief that these materials if brought together would constitute a valuable book of consolation. Other extracts of a similar character have been added; and upon whatever page the reader may open, it is believed that he will find 'words of comfort.'"

New Publications. — Mr. Kaufman's Translation of Tholuck's "Commentary on the Gospel of St. John" has just appeared. It makes a duodecimo volume of four hundred and seventy-four pages. A Translation of Olshausen's Commentaries on the New Testament has been undertaken at Princeton, N. J. Hug's Introduction to the writings of the New Testament, translated by D. Fosdick, Jr., with notes by Professor Stuart, will soon be published. A new volume on Hermeneutics is also announced as in the course of preparation by Professor Stuart.

THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

Nº. LXXV.

THIRD SERIES — Nº. VI.

JULY, 1836.

ART. I. — *The Life of Philip Melancthon, comprising an Account of the most important Transactions of the Reformation.* By F. A. Cox, D. D., LL. D., of London. First American from the Second London Edition, with important Alterations by the Author, for this Edition. Boston: 1835. 12mo. pp. 316.

WE are disposed to regard with favor any attempt to throw light upon that portion of the history of the church, which commonly passes under the name of the Reformation. This term usually designates a much more contracted period than it should. To enlarge our views of this period, to show how early and almost imperceptible was the beginning of the Reformation, how many names are to be reckoned among its instruments before the appearance of those to whom it is chiefly ascribed, how remarkable were the concurring circumstances which then caused its developement, and how natural the influences which rendered it an imperfect work, is a service honorable to every one who performs it faithfully, and useful to the cause of Christianity and the advance of society. It is particularly useful to study the variety of character, which both gave and received an impulse from this great movement; to observe how widely different were the agents employed, and how wonderfully the most opposite materials, — good and bad passions, fierce and gentle qualities, strong and weak minds, the highest and the lowest motives, — were made to contribute to the one great work. It may teach us

never to despair of reform, because the instruments are not all such as we should choose, nor the measures to be wholly approved. It never has been so with any reform. It can never be expected. We attach too much importance to the little or the great evils which attend the first steps of a moral revolution. We are too slow to yield our sympathy and co-operation, too apt to withhold even our faith and prayers, because the hands engaged are not all clean, nor the heads the most sound. We are particularly and beyond reason disturbed by any excess of zeal, the least extravagance or violence in the leaders of reform; forgetting that the moderate and peace-loving, however virtuous and wise, are never the first to disturb the things that are, nor willing to raise the commotions and encounter the perils, without which great changes are seldom begun and never completed. He, however, is a bad casuist and an equivocal Christian, who would draw from such facts and concessions, a sanction for extravagance and violence, or encourage by a look the doers of evil, because good may come of it. It is one thing to have confidence in God and faith in man's advancement; it is another, and most criminal, to advocate any principles or measures but those of truth and love.

The leading characters and events of the Reformation are familiar to all readers. Yet the prominence given to Luther and Calvin, — a prominence secured by their rude and daring traits, and their doctrinal peculiarities, more than by mental or moral superiority, — has overshadowed many less obtrusive but scarcely less important names, and delayed the justice which must sooner or later be rendered them. Among these an important place must be allowed to Melancthon. His name is not unknown, nor his memory unhonored. No name is more closely associated with that of Luther, for no one was admitted to share more largely his intimacy and his labors. Few men have differed more in disposition than they; but this difference did not prevent confidence or coöperation; and if at any time these were interrupted, their very difference of character helped to restore the harmony. They exerted happy influences upon each other. Luther's impetuosity was often checked by Melancthon's mildness; while this mildness, when it became timidity, was stimulated and emboldened by the other's fearlessness. Luther, too, derived no little advantage from Melancthon's superior learning.

At least, such is the opinion of Dr. Cox, who in making the first attempt to give a full and separate English biography of Melancthon, though he can hardly be said to have made the most of his materials and his subject, has certainly done a good service to the Christian community. He has not only introduced a character, new to many, very familiar probably to few; but he has rescued that character from the reproach which has sometimes been thrown upon it, when all the excellence and claims of Melancthon have been passed by with a single reflection on his want of decision and courage. It will be seen, we think, that his defects of this kind have been overrated, while the influence he exerted upon the cause of religion and letters, and the part he acted in the great events of the sixteenth century, have not always been duly estimated.

Philip Melancthon was born, February 16th, 1497, at Bretten, in Saxony. His father's name was George Schwartzerd. But the son, following a common custom of the learned at that time, and the advice of a patron, to whom, at the age of thirteen, he dedicated a humorous piece in the form of a comedy, took the name of Melancthon, as having the same signification in Greek with Schwartzerd in German, — *Black-earth.* He seems to have fallen early into the hands of more judicious as well as abler teachers than most of his cotemporaries, and was accustomed to say of Luther, in after life, that if he had been as thoroughly disciplined as himself by the studies of a sound philosophy, it might have moderated the vehemence of his natural temper. Melancthon's temper was of the most gentle and amiable kind, and secured for him the love even of the boys whom he challenged to contests in rules of grammar, in which he was usually victorious. In his twelfth year, he was matriculated at the University of Heidelberg, where his talents, aided by severe application, brought him at once into notice. He is said to have written even for the professors themselves, and he composed, at that early age, Rudiments of the Greek language, which were afterwards published. Having a naturally feeble constitution, to which he thought his situation at Heidelberg unfavorable, and being refused, on account of his youth, a high degree, he removed, in 1512, to Tubingen, in the duchy of Wurtemberg, where he devoted himself to the different studies of classical and polite learning, mathematics, jurisprudence, logic, medicine,

and theology. Of the last study, which was then chiefly made up of scholastic subtilties, he discerned and pursued the more rational parts, to a degree not common in those times. Before he had reached the age of seventeen, he was made Doctor in Philosophy, and soon became a public lecturer, not only in the Greek and Latin authors, but also in several of the departments named above. This was a remarkable distinction, and attracted the notice of the learned generally. Erasmus, in particular, was strong and loud in his admiration. "What hopes may we not entertain of Philip Melancthon; though almost a boy, yet equally to be admired for his proficiency in both languages! what power of invention! what purity of diction! what vastness of memory! what variety of reading! what a modest, graceful, and almost princely bearing!" Writing to Œcolampadius about this boy of eighteen, Erasmus says, with peculiar simplicity, — "I am persuaded Christ designs this youth to excel us all; he will totally eclipse Erasmus!" He appears to have become already so general a favorite, that even his religious opponents spoke well of him; quite a rarity in those days.

What were the peculiarities of his religious opinions at this age, we are not told; except that, at one period of his life, he expresses his sorrow for his early zeal in the idolatrous services of the Catholic Church. Yet we find him early the subject of remark on account of his constant and public use of the Bible, which he carried with him wherever he went, kept constantly in his hand at church, and wrote explanations and reflections in the margin. For this he sometimes incurred very severe censure, but, with all his supposed timidity, was never turned from his purpose. From some of his Epistles, it may be inferred that he was a believer in judicial astrology, a caster of nativities, and an interpreter of dreams; which Jortin, in his "Life of Erasmus," pronounces "a strange weakness in so great a man," as Melancthon. A weakness it may have been, but not strange, we apprehend, among even the most learned of that age. He early foresaw, that violent disputes would arise concerning the doctrine of the Trinity; and pronounced curious inquiries into the nature of Christ to be not useful or necessary. This fact, not noticed, we believe, in the Life before us, sufficiently shows the freedom of his mind, and the leaning of his opinions.

From Tubingen, after a residence of about six years, Me-

lancthon, at the age of twenty-one, was removed to the University of Wittenberg, chiefly by the influence of the founder of that University, the Elector Frederic, who obtained for him a Greek professorship. His inaugural oration, delivered four days after his arrival, attracted unusual attention, and drew forth lavish commendations from Luther, who is here first introduced to us in connexion with Melancthon, as his pupil in the Greek language, though fourteen years older than his teacher. Their friendship became at once confiding and cordial, and continued so to the last of life. It is not surprising that a Catholic historian * should say of them at this period, — "Melancthon fell into the hands of Luther, who abused his easy disposition, and availed himself of all those fine talents, which ought to have been devoted to the service of the Catholic Church." We do not see that either of these individuals abused the other. On the contrary, Luther's strong passions were singularly restrained by the gentleness of his favorite coadjutor, and seldom vented themselves upon him with the violence that many experienced. The union of two such minds, the coöperation of talents and tempers so remarkable, yet so different, is one illustration of the fact already adverted to, that the wisdom of Providence, above that of man, selects and uses the most various instruments for the same work. In the fierce contests which were then waged between the disciples of the Scholastic and of the Peripatetic philosophy, contests which often ended in the palpable and cutting arguments of fists, clubs, and swords, Luther and Melancthon came to no rupture, though the former made great use of Aristotle, and the latter condemned him. To revive the low state of philosophy and literature, was now Melancthon's great aim; yet so low was it, that the very attempt subjected him to half-suppressed reproaches and slanders, while his talents and fame awed even the prejudices of such opponents. His lectures upon Homer and the Greek text of St. Paul, inspired the great body of the theologians, high and low, with the love of Greek, as Luther tells us in his Letters, in which he calls him — "the most learned, and most truly Grecian, Philip Melancthon:" — "he is a mere boy and a stripling, if you consider his age; but our great man and master, if you reflect on the variety of his knowledge, which extends to almost every book."

---

* M. Baillet.

While Melancthon was thus devoted and successful in imparting his own interest in classic literature, though under every disadvantage from an ignorant, indolent, and licentious, yet professedly most religious age, — its very religion being at once the offspring and guardian of its ignorance, and opposing the most formidable obstacles, — he labored to engage this revival of letters, and use all its power, in behalf of sacred studies. This appears in one of his first orations at Wittenberg, on "reforming the studies of youth," of which Dr. Cox translates a large portion. We make an extract, which will give some idea of his mode of treating such subjects, and of his aim.

"But the manner in which you apply to *sacred studies* is of the greatest importance. These, above all other pursuits, require judgment, experience, and diligence; and remember that the perfume of divine ointments, so to speak, far surpasses the aromatics of human literature. Under the guidance of God, the cultivation of the liberal arts will be rendered subservient to sacred objects; as Synesius intimates to Herculianus, 'the noblest employment of life, is to use philosophy as a guide to divine knowledge.' If this should not be quite obvious to any one, let him consider that brass was sent by the King of Tyre for the temple of Solomon, as well as superior metal: so it is in reference to theology, which comprehends Hebrew and Greek literature, for the Latins drink from these streams and sources, and those foreign languages are requisite to be known, lest we should appear nothing better than ciphers among theologians. But there the accuracies and beauties of language will be seen, and the genuine sense of terms and expressions discovered with noontide evidence. Having ascertained the literal meaning of words, we shall be able to pursue the course of argument notwithstanding any frigid glosses, discordant comments, or other hindrances that may be interposed." . . . . .

"The great importance then of giving a new impulse and direction to your studies, and the manner in which they are likely to become conducive to your mental and moral character, are sufficiently obvious. Who can help deploring the state of our immediate predecessors, who, abandoning the light of learning, plunged into Tartarean darkness, and took up with the very dregs of knowledge? And who is not affected at the lamentable state of our own times, deprived by negligence of our ancient authors, and of all the advantages which would have accrued from their writings, had they been preserved? You should understand, therefore, the difficulties which attend the acquisition of the most valuable knowledge; nevertheless, industry will so overcome them, that I

trust you will obtain that which is of real importance with far less expense of time and trouble, than is generally devoted to what is useless."— pp. 31, 32.

The period of which we are writing was one of profound calm in the bosom of the Church. It cannot be said the Reformation had not begun, for its elements had been repeatedly agitated, and they were now only slumbering to gather new force. The commotions caused by Waldus, as early as the twelfth century, by Wickliff in the fourteenth, and Huss in the fifteenth, all of whom, with many others, had openly and boldly inveighed against the errors of Popery, had subsided. Those errors continued in all their strength, and the corruptions of the Church and her clergy were rank and shameless. The sale of indulgences, which had been occasionally resorted to for three or four centuries, for the private emolument of those who dispensed them, became more public and enormous, until, in 1517, the infamous Tetzel, having pursued his traffic with great success in the neighbourhood of Wittenberg, Luther and Melancthon, both professors in the University, were completely roused. Luther of course was the first to act, though Melancthon, who gives a particular account of the whole controversy, was neither unconcerned nor neutral. He says Luther himself "did not in the least suspect or dream of the change about to be accomplished, nor indeed of rooting out indulgences." Luther issued his ninety-five propositions against Tetzel, which may be considered the first act in what the timid Erasmus called the "Lutheran Tragedy"; but he at the same time wrote respectful and even humble letters to the Pope, and was much displeased with the students of Wittenberg, for having burned Tetzel's propositions in return for similar treatment of his own writings. Indeed, if the facts which Dr. Cox gives, may be relied on, there was more caution and moderation in the conduct of Luther at that time, than we have been wont to allow him. His three controversies with the Cardinal Cajetan, whom Leo the Tenth commissioned to meet him at Augsburg, terminated peaceably; and even in 1519, Miltitz, the successor of Cajetan, prevailed upon him to write a submissive letter to the Pope. In all these disputations, Melancthon evidently aided, as well as approved, the efforts of Luther. And in the six days' discussion at Leipsic between Eckius the great papal advocate, and Carlostadt, another professor of Wittenberg and a zealous reformer, Melancthon is said to have gone up to Carlostadt so often, in

the midst of the debate, to whisper useful suggestions, that Eckius was provoked to exclaim at last, "Hold your tongue, Philip, and mind your own business."

This was the beginning of Melancthon's public agency in the work of the Reformation. It drew him at once into the controversy, and he did not shrink from it. He gives in a letter his opinion of the disputants, allowing erudition and ingenuity to Eckius, but claiming higher excellence for Luther, who had taken the place of Carlostadt in the discussion, and conducted it with a power, which was overcome only "by noise and gesture." This account brought upon Melancthon a violent attack from Eckius, which he answered by a tract, written with such mildness and acuteness, that it proved highly serviceable to the Lutheran cause. All that is here given us of this tract, exhibits its author as frank, intelligent, firm, and charitable, to a far greater degree than was common in the controversies of that day. We see no cowardice or indecision, nor a particle of bitterness or partisan ambition. His meekness and honesty are striking. "He is, believe me, the dearest of all my friends," he writes, "who is most honest and downright in his remarks; for you know, as it is not my disposition to dissemble, so I always look upon flattering friends as they deserve."

Melancthon was so assiduous in the discharge of his duties in the University, that the omission of his lectures for the single day of his marriage, was a matter of public remark, and thrown into pleasant verse. This was in 1520, and the connexion then formed was of the happiest kind, giving him, for thirty-seven years, a wife eminent for piety and active benevolence. Their house was free to all, and was crowded with applicants for every kind of aid. None were refused, but all treated with that attention and generosity, which show him to have been more kind than wise; for it not only made a heavy tax upon his time, but exposed him to great impositions. He seems always to have been perfectly reckless of compensation for his own labors, and foolishly prodigal of his limited means. He had four children, and no press of public engagements ever made him forgetful of parental duties or domestic comforts.

The time had now come to test Melancthon's courage, and compel him either to retreat, or stand in the very front of the battle. It was in this year, that Luther was put under the ban of the Church; and though the Pope's bull against him was

violently resisted and never fully executed, it had the effect of producing the crisis. His books were burnt. He, on the other hand, declared, that if he did not himself burn the whole pontifical code, it would only be from want of fire. Fire was found, and, in December, 1520, the bull and all similar documents were committed to the flames, and the die was cast. Melancthon was at his post at Wittenberg, but his pen was busy and his spirit strong for the condemned heretics. "Martin still lives and prospers, notwithstanding the indignation and fury of Leo, to whom all things have hitherto been supposed possible. Nobody approves the bull which Eckius is enforcing, unless it be those who are more concerned for their own ease and indulgence than for the success of the Gospel." The Diet at Worms follows; Luther appears before it, but recants nothing; its formidable edict is issued against him, and his danger is such, that his patron, the Elector, seizes him on his return from the Diet, and conceals him in the castle of Wartenberg for safety. This act placed Melancthon virtually at the head of the Reformers. So Luther represented the matter to him from his place of confinement, and so Melancthon himself regarded it. His constitutional melancholy, combining with his humility, made him tremble under the responsibility; but he did not waver. He confronted the many opposers who started up in the absence of the heresiarch, at home and abroad. He directed not only his learning, but his powers of sarcasm, against the divines of the Sorbonne in France, who had published a formal condemnation of Luther's writings. He promptly answered them by "An Apology for Luther, in Opposition to the furious Decree of the Parisian Theologasters." This pamphlet is fearless and searching. Its tone and power may be judged of by a single sentence: "You do not accuse, or convince by argument, but, contrary both to divine and human laws, at once *condemn*, and for no other reason than because you are the Sorbonne divines and lords of our faith to be sure! For shame! For shame! But stay, I must not treat the *Sorbonne* so irreverently! — The Sorbonne only is to be believed *without* SCRIPTURE!" This was but one of several able controversial pieces published by Melancthon this first year of the open revolt. Nor pamphlets alone. His great work, "Loci Communes Theologici," appeared about the same time, became at once popular in France and Italy as well as at home, and was spoken of by many in all places as "the best book next to the

holy Scriptures." This work treats fully of almost every doctrine and duty, that has ever been drawn into controversy. It is decidedly trinitarian, and sufficiently orthodox for all but the Popé, and his thorough adherents. Its influence, however, must have been altogether in favor of free inquiry, the great hinge of the Reformation, and few works are supposed to have done better service to the cause. The power of calm faith which it manifests, and the spirit of piety and meekness which it breathes, are refreshing in the midst of such denunciations as came from almost every other quarter, not excepting by any means his brothers Luther and Calvin, much as they praised this work. The latter published an edition of it at Geneva in 1551, eulogizing its author in the strongest terms. A better eulogy would have been a slight portion of the same spirit.

During this memorable year, an attempt was made by the Augustinian Friars at Wittenberg to abolish private masses. The Elector, well-disposed but alarmed, remonstrated; wherefore Melancthon was chosen, with five others, to consider and carry it through. In their report to the Elector, they strongly urged him "to put an end to the Popish masses throughout his whole territory, and not to be deterred by the reproaches of those, who would brand him with the name of Heretic or Hussite." Frederic was still in favor of deferring, but they insisted and prevailed; so far as their act and influence could go, the measure was carried, and the Elector connived at innovations which he dared not publicly sanction.

It is well known, that Luther occupied himself, during his singular imprisonment by the Elector, in preparing his German version of the Scriptures for publication, on which he labored indefatigably. He tells us, — "I translated not only the Gospel of John, but the whole New Testament, in my Patmos; and Melancthon and I have begun to revise the whole." — Melancthon had aided him in this work before he left his place of concealment; and when, in March, 1522, Luther resolved to face the world again at all hazards, and returned to Wittenberg without consulting even Frederic, Melancthon and four others engaged with him in the work, and published it in separate portions, until the whole was completed in 1530. About this time, Melancthon's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans was also published; not by its author, but by Luther, who, with his wonted boldness, stole the manuscript, printed it, and then apologized by saying, that he had only

done what Melancthon ought to have done, and that he should do the same with his Comments on other parts of the Bible, if he did not send them out himself. The appearance of different portions of the Bible, in this gradual way, and with the authority of such names, gave a prodigious impulse to the Reformation. A counter influence, however, was felt from the mad zeal of a few of the Reformers, especially Carlostadt, — from the general division in their ranks on the Sacramental controversy, one of the most childish and violent, yet one of the most instructive of all controversies, — and from the death, in 1525, of Frederic the Elector, the early friend, and steady though timid defender of the heretical cause. In the controversy just referred to, Melancthon stood with Luther in support of the real presence, against Zuingle, with whom he afterward held a personal public discussion, though to no purpose. Still he labored to effect a reconciliation between the parties, which was repeatedly prevented by the violence of Luther, but was partially accomplished many years later, after the death of Zuingle. There was another controversy, of a less public nature, between Luther and Erasmus, in which the former called Erasmus all manner of hard names, and Melancthon as usual endeavoured to soften his asperity. Dr. Cox tells us, that Melancthon himself received long and artful letters from Erasmus, endeavouring to prejudice him against Luther and the unpopular side. We incline to think that Dr. Cox makes Erasmus worse than he was; for, though there is evidence of his timidity and duplicity, enough to make one blush and weep for the man, it is not to be forgotten that his writings and early efforts were decidedly for reform, that there was scarcely a corrupt opinion or practice of the Romish Church which he did not assail before Luther, and that he gave some reason for that common saying of the day: "Erasmus laid the egg, and Luther hatched it."* We have no thought of palliating the shrinking and shuffling policy of Erasmus. He was not made for a Reformer of the age in which he lived, and might never have removed the deep-rooted evils of any age. He understood himself better than he undersood the claims of Christianity at such a time, when

* Erasmus, however, is reported to have said, in reference to this proverb, "But I laid a hen's egg, and Luther hath hatched a very different bird."

he said, "I had no inclination to die for the sake of the truth. Every man hath not the courage requisite to make a martyr; and I am afraid, that, if I were put to the trial, I should imitate St. Peter." * This is melancholy. But neither this, nor any degree of weakness, should prevent our acknowledging the eminent services which he rendered, at different times and in many ways, to the cause of truth and letters. We have thought that the character of Melancthon presents a happy medium between those of Luther and Erasmus; combining enough of the decision of the one with the caution of the other, without the violence or cowardice of either. And we are struck with a fact which Cox relates of Luther, that he was found on one occasion drawing his own and other characters in the following brief sentence: "Res et verba, Philippus; verba sine rebus, Erasmus; res sine verbis, Lutherus; nec res, nec verba, Carolostadius."

A prominent act in the life of Melancthon is the part he took in the great Diet of Augsburg, at which the Emperor Charles the Fifth presided, in 1530. Luther, having been proscribed by the edict of Worms, could not be present, and the Reformers, to whom the occasion was one of most anxious interest, threw the chief labor and responsibility on Melancthon. He was prevailed upon, though his diffidence resisted for some time, to draw up for the Emperor, and the papal delegates, an extended statement of the views of his own party. The result was the celebrated *Confession of Augsburg*, from the pen of Melancthon. It was presented both in German and Latin, and, when it was read and the Catholics were asked if they could overthrow it out of the Scriptures, even Eckius declared, — "No; by the Holy Scriptures we cannot overthrow it, but we may by the Fathers." This they attempted in the statement offered in reply, which was sustained by Charles in an oration that Melancthon calls infamous. Every attempt was made to awe or win back the Protestants to the infallible church. Melancthon was particularly assailed, in the hope that his gentle nature would yield. It did yield every thing unimportant, and in the final conference, in which the whole matter was left to him and Eckius, the principal points of dispute were reduced to three, mass, vows, and the celibacy of priests. Here neither side would make any

* Jortin's Life of Erasmus, Vol. I. p. 250.

concessions, and Melancthon, unyielding in principle but dreading the consequences, writes — "We expect violent measures, for no moderation can satisfy the Popish faction. They, in fact, seek our destruction. Pray that God may preserve us." A decree was at length issued, the Diet having been in session from June to November, condemning the new doctrines utterly, and putting all who refused to disown them under the ban of the empire. The Protestant princes and divines retired dissatisfied and disappointed, but not dismayed. They immediately took defensive measures for the preservation of their liberties. The following description of one of their conferences is pleasant, and exhibits some of Melancthon's most remarkable traits.

"Soon after these transactions, Melancthon, Luther, and other divines met together to consult on the best measures to be adopted in the present exigency. After having spent some time in prayer to God, from whom alone they could expect adequate assistance, Melancthon was called suddenly out of the room, from which he retired under great depression of spirits. He saw during his absence some of the elders of the reformed churches with their parishioners and families. Several children were also brought hanging at the breast, while others a little older were engaged in prayer. This reminded him, he said, of the prophetic language, 'Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings hast thou ordained strength because of thine enemies, that thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger.' Animated by this interesting scene, he returned to his friends with a disencumbered mind and a cheerful countenance. Luther, astonished at this sudden change, said, 'What now! what has happened to you, Philip, that you are become so cheerful?' 'O sirs,' replied Melancthon, 'let us not be discouraged, for I have seen our noble protectors, and such as I will venture to say will prove invincible against every foe!' — 'And pray,' returned Luther, thrilling with surprise and pleasure, 'who and where are these powerful heroes?' — 'Oh!' said Melancthon, '*they are the wives of our parishioners and their little children, whose prayers I have just witnessed, — prayers which I am satisfied our God will hear:* for as our heavenly Father and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ has never despised nor rejected our supplications, we have reason to trust that he will not in the present alarming crisis.'" — p. 187.

Melancthon's services at this time were in great demand. There seems to have been a peculiar confidence reposed both in his learning and discretion. Almost all important transac-

tions, especially in writing, were intrusted to him. A Directory was to be composed for the use of the reformed churches. It was committed to Melancthon, under the immediate sanction of the Elector John, who had succeeded his brother Frederic, and, being of a more decided character, was a still more powerful patron of the Reformers. The Directory, which was thus prepared, was called "Libellus Visitatorius," and is worthy of mention because great use was made of it by the Papists, to prove the defection of Melancthon from the principles of Luther. In this they exulted, and renewed their attempts to gain the yielding dissenter. He thus speaks of it. — "I am applied to from Bohemia to desert the reformed cause, and promised any remuneration from King Ferdinand. Indeed my defection is publicly reported as a fact, because, in the little book written for the reformed churches, I have shown an increased degree of moderation; and yet you perceive, I have really inserted nothing different from what Luther constantly maintains. But because I have employed no asperity of language, these very acute men judge, that I necessarily differ from Luther." He was now strongly importuned, by special messengers from Francis the First, to visit France to appease the disputes of the Church there; and soon after a similar invitation came from Henry the Eighth, to visit England. It is evident, however, that these solicitations proceeded more from political than religious considerations; and it was probably well that Melancthon was prevented by the Elector from complying with them, though himself inclined to do so. The public execution of six Lutherans at Paris, about the same time, shows what reliance could be placed upon the professions of Francis; and every one knows that Henry was more interested then in divorces than in reformations. He renewed the attempt more than once to prevail on Melancthon to visit him; but it resulted only in a correspondence, in which the reformer did all in his power to turn the influence of the monarch to the benefit of true religion.

It is an index to the state of the times and to the conduct of most of the Reformers, that the only one of them, who seems to have been distinguished for a mild and conciliating temper, was continually suspected of deserting their cause. Melancthon could not even take a journey for his health, to which he was several times compelled, without being charged with having quarrelled with Luther and separated from his adherents.

And yet there was hardly a council on any occasion of importance, at which the burden of the Protestant efforts was not thrown upon him, and manfully sustained. Another instance of this occurred in 1537, in the general council held at Smalcald, which Luther was prevented from attending by severe illness. The great question there was, how much might be conceded to the Catholics for peace and harmony without yielding principle. And to this question Melancthon was employed to prepare the answer. He did it in a manner, that satisfied many, and should have satisfied all his calumniators, that his principles were uncompromising, and his courage fully equal to his mildness. The paper was of signal use in strengthening the hands of the Protestants, and many events soon followed which gave them new encouragement and success, their cause being openly espoused by several powerful princes. But the happiness of Melancthon himself was greatly abated by his own hypochondriacal temperament, by the misconduct of a son-in-law, by sickness which reduced him to the last degree, and from which, he afterward said, nothing but the arrival of his friend Luther could have revived him; and not least, by the extravagance of the Sacramentarians, and the bitterness of Luther in that controversy. The friends appear to have come nearer a separation on this last point, than on any other, such was the vehemence of the one, and the forbearance of the other. From one declaration of Melancthon, we infer that his mind was not entirely satisfied with the doctrine of the real presence, though he adhered to it. "I commit the affair to Christ, that his divine wisdom may best consult his own glory. I have hitherto always entertained the hope, that he could, by some means, make it plain what is the true doctrine of the sacrament."

The period from 1545 to 1550 was marked by the most desperate attempts on the part of the Pope, aided by the insidious Emperor Charles, to subdue the Reformers, though by the edge of the sword. At this crisis, in 1546, Luther died; and Melancthon, after twenty-eight years of uninterrupted intimacy with one who did much to animate and nerve his courage, was compelled to stand alone. Having pronounced the funeral oration, which Dr. Cox gives at length, he returned in sorrow, but not dismay, to the arduous, and, at that moment, perilous work of leading the Reformation, at least in all written declarations. He attended seven conferences, and wrote all the pieces that were presented, and this without abandoning his

duties as Professor; for, although the commotions of the day had at one time driven him and his family from Wittenberg and scattered the students, within a year he again collected them and went on calmly with his lectures. Again the University was driven from Wittenberg by the plague, and again reassembled by Melancthon, at Torgau, no cares nor fears being able to turn him from his love of literature and efforts to promote it. His devotion to this is remarkable, when we look at the character of the times, and the press of public, exciting, and responsible duties always devolving upon him. He describes himself just at this time as "tormented upon the rack of incessant engagement, and absolutely distracted with writing disputations, rules and regulations, prefaces, and letters."

We are pleased to see Dr. Cox's independent and unqualified testimony in regard to the death of Servetus, which took place in 1553. But we are grieved and exceedingly surprised to see Melancthon approving of that death, and praising the piety and judgment of those who caused it. And yet we are constantly taught, by the past and the present, not to expect to find any man entirely free from the corruptions of his own age, either in doctrine or conduct. The gross inconsistency of the Reformers of that day, and of some Protestants and Puritans of a later day, read wholesome lessons to those who would study the human heart. It is time, that all biographers expressed themselves as fearlessly, as the one before us, in reprobation of the part which Calvin acted in the dark tragedy now referred to. And the time may come,—it will come as surely as "knowledge shall be increased,"—when few names will stand higher among those to be honored for the Reformation, than the name of Michael Servetus. The principle, for which he contended and died, was the very principle advocated by Melancthon in his last conference with the opposite party, at Worms, in 1557. The subject of dispute was, *the rule of judgment in religious concerns;* a subject in which he was decided and uncompromising. He seemed to regard it in its true light, as the one great question of the Reformation. He aimed, more directly and honestly than some who have followed him in the Protestant ranks, to merge all other questions in this,—Whether the Church or the Bible be supreme? And if he did not always see as clearly, that the same individual and independent mind, which decides for

itself that question, must be allowed also to decide for itself what the Bible teaches and demands, — we must remember, that there are thousands still, who cannot see, or will not own, that principle of the Reformation, though they appropriate to themselves the doctrines, and glory in the success, of the Reformers. The true doctrine of the Reformation itself, and of Christianity, is well expressed by Dr. Cox in these words: "It is the birth-right of every human being to think for himself; he is amenable alone to conscience and to God for his religious sentiments, and whoever attempts to legislate for the free-born soul, and coerce the faith of another, is perpetrating one of the most detestable of crimes, robbing man of his liberty, and God of his authority."

While Melancthon was engaged in the conference at Worms, he heard of the death of his wife. This with other domestic trials preyed upon his health, and made him sensible that his race was nearly run. Still he continued his labors incessantly, and issued the next year, the first part of his great work, the *Chronicon*, comprising a general history of leading events, from the creation to the period of the Reformation. On this work, and in the duties of his professorship, he labored almost to the last day of his life. Nothing could prevent his going to meet his students, after he was so weak that he could scarcely stand. His mind retained all its vigor to the last, and his serenity of spirit and words of parting, were those of an apostle who has finished his course and kept the faith. He died in April, 1560, at the age of sixty-three.

It would not be a wise use of our own time, or that of our readers, to attempt a formal delineation of the character of Melancthon. If we have given any thing like a faithful sketch of his life, every one can best read the character there for himself. Dr. Cox seems to us to have performed the office of a biographer, — a far more difficult and responsible office, than is thought by many who venture upon it, — with industry and impartiality, though not with the highest degree of ability. He has not claimed for the subject of his notice, all excellence, entire freedom from error or failings; but he has vindicated him successfully from every charge of pusillanimity and time-serving. He has shown that he possessed the very opposite qualities in no ordinary measure. He has shown it by facts, more than by assertions or reasonings; facts, which require the inference, and attest the character, expressed by

him in these few words: Melancthon was "firm but not violent, modest but not servile, conscientious but not punctilious." The same character is given him by Mosheim, in equally expressive and merited terms: "In this great and good man, a soft and yielding temper was joined with the most inviolable fidelity, and the most invincible attachment to the truth."

Of the learning, indefatigable perseverance, and great influence of Melancthon, there probably are not two opinions. It must be clear to all, that few, if any minds, shed more light on the principles contended for in that eventful struggle, that no hand performed more labor, and no life rendered more consistent and essential service to the work of regenerating the Christian world. He brought a judgment chastened and enriched by classical study, and a memory stored with various knowledge, to all investigations of truth; and gave evidence that the revival of learning was inseparable, in his view, from that of religion. His almost diminutive figure is said to have continued always meagre, from his abstemiousness and industry. But the vigorous and clear mind beamed from the open countenance, and threw its light into other minds, and distant places, and all subjects on which it glanced, with a power and gentleness blending in higher and more harmonious proportions than has often been witnessed. Germany spoke of him as her Teacher, and historians have called him the great doctor of the Lutheran church; while others, with yet greater felicity, have entitled him *the* PEN *of the Reformation.*

We leave him with a passage from Luther, as honorable to the writer, as to the friend whom he thus commends. They have often been contrasted, but by no one better, perhaps, than by Luther himself, in this passage from his preface to one of Melancthon's Commentaries; — "*I* am born to be for ever fighting with opponents and with the Devil himself, which gives a controversial and warlike cast to all my works. I clear the ground of stumps and trees, root up thorns and briars, fill up ditches, raise causeys, and smooth the roads through the wood. But to Philip Melancthon it belongs, by the grace of God, to perform a milder and more grateful labor, — to build, to plant, to sow, to water, to please by elegance and taste. O happy circumstance, and shame to their ingratitude who are not sensible of it!" E. B. H.

ART. II. — *The True Plan of a Living Temple; or Man considered in his proper Relation to the Ordinary Occupations and Pursuits of Life.* By the Author of "The Morning and Evening Sacrifice," "The Last Supper," and "Farewell to Time." In Three Volumes. 12mo. Edinburgh and London: 1830.

FOR a general notice of this work, and the other publications by the same author, we must refer the reader to the last Number of the Examiner.* We return to the subject, according to our promise, that we may go on with and finish our analysis of "The True Plan of a Living Temple," having brought it down already to the end of the *Second Part.*

The author, having ascertained, as we have seen, the condition and relations of man, viewed as a subject of God's Universal Kingdom; and having shown that it is his main object, in this relation, to fulfill well the duties of that condition in life, in which he finds himself placed; proceeds in the *Third* part of the work before us, to inquire "into the best *mode* of accomplishing this object." It is not however his design to give particular directions for the conduct of life in this part, — these being reserved for the fourth or concluding portion of the treatise, — but to point out the *General Method*, by which the real objects of the present existence may be best secured. In addressing himself to this purpose, he first considers Life, or the situation of men in this world, as divided into "three great fields." The first embraces that high or "Ideal" field, in which the great and pure conceptions of the soul find their fitting objects. The second comprises that visible and tangible "diurnal sphere," in which are contained the common interests, the hourly vexations, the rough contentions, the daily occupations, and never-ceasing labors of man; — in a word, the "Actual" and palpable interests of this present life. And the third includes those more minute and more evanescent duties, "which it requires a finer eye to perceive, and much good conscience to improve; but which have a powerful, though often imperceptible influence on the successful issue of the more obvious and rougher duties which are more constantly in view." On these "three

* Christian Examiner, Number LXXIV., for May, 1836, p. 169.

fields" of duty our limits now scarcely permit us to enter. We can do no more than point out a few positions taken by our author, which seem to us to be either peculiar to him, or important in the practical philosophy of life.

In regard to the "Ideal, — or the Doctrine relating to a high standard of Excellence," the prominent position is this; — "That in order to accomplish the object proposed to man, as a subject of the kingdom of God, he must be careful to preserve a high or pure feeling of the degree of excellence which he is capable of attaining, — in other words, his notion of ideal excellence must be maintained in full power." In illustrating this very important maxim, he very properly takes a distinction between making this high excellence or *beau idéal* of conduct, or, in other words, perfection, the definite *object* which a man should propose to himself, — and employing this imaginary perfection as a beautiful and inspiring *means* of aiding him in the performance of actual duties, which are the proper object of man, considered as a subject of the kingdom of God. There is, certainly, a wide difference, as has already been said, between considering this perfection a fixed and absolute object of desire, beyond which, from its very definition, there is nothing to be done or gained, and regarding it as an Ideal Model, which varies with the attainments of every individual, and with the attainments of the same individual at different times. There is a plain difference between aiming at an impossible and inconceivable perfection of these essentially imperfect natures of ours, considered as a definite and ultimate result, and placing before us a degree of excellence not yet attained, which, like Virgil's Galatea, only so far reveals itself to our mental vision, as to stimulate pursuit, and ever flees as we pursue;

"Et fugit ad salices, et se cupit ante videri."

And as in all the Arts of Design, which minister to our intellectual tastes, no high excellence can ever be achieved, but by placing before the mind a model of beauty which has never been realized in the most admirable productions of genius; so, in that most lovely and excellent as well as difficult of all arts, — the *Art of Right Ordering one's own Life*, we must have always present before the mind a beauty of thought, sentiment, and conduct, which will never permit us to remain satisfied with ourselves as we are, but urges us

to be pressing continually onward, to a high and still higher mark in our high calling. This is the only true and available meaning of those much mystified precepts, which may be all summed up in the injunction, — "*Strive after perfection.*" He who hopes to gain a sinless and impeccable state of character, will certainly be baffled in his aim; and he who, in the literal sense of the terms, aspires to be "perfect, as God is perfect," aspires to become God. This, according to our author, if we rightly understand him, is the use that should be made of the "Ideal" in fulfilling the proper object of life.

Passing several affiliated topics, we come next to the "Actual" field of human duty. This second compartment is regarded as comprising those "rougher and more substantial labors which belong to every man as the occupant of a definite station amidst actually existing interests." It is the great field of real life, and the author, properly, as we think, assumes the position, that the successful discharge of the duties herein individually imposed upon us, ought to be the great object of our endeavours, and every thing else should have a direct reference to these duties. Some remarks follow on the "dangers incident to minds too exclusively occupied with notions of ideal excellence," and a reply is given to the question, "how life and its incidents ought to be viewed," which contain some very judicious and practical remarks. We may not stop to quote them, but recommend them to the earnest attention of that not altogether uninteresting, but rather useless class of persons, who, standing aloof from all hearty and affectionate intercourse with ordinary life, and burying themselves in comparative retirement, are mainly occupied with reveries concerning an ideal excellence of human nature. They should remember that this excellence, after all, is only a relative thing, and, as far as it is attainable, is not to be gained by discoursing "about it and about it," however eloquently, but by an earnest grappling with Duty in whatsoever form it comes; and by a faithful, kind, cheerful obedience to the claim of the passing hour, however humble it may be. "To work!" says one, whose affectations of style, and constant straining after point and originality of phrase do not prevent him from being, occasionally, an effective writer, — "What incalculable sources of cultivation lie in that process, in that attempt; how it lays hold of the whole man, not of a small, theoretical calculating fraction of him, but of the whole practical, doing and daring

and enduring man; thereby to waken dormant faculties, root out old errors, at every step. He that has done nothing, has known nothing. Vain is it to sit scheming and plausibly discoursing; up and be doing! If thy knowledge be real, put it forth from thee. . . . . *Do* one thing, for the first time in thy life do a thing; a new light will rise to thee on the doing of all things whatsoever. Truly, a boundless significance lies in *work*."

The third and last "field" now opens on our view. It is that of "Small Duties"; — a field much neglected in the labors of moralists, but one, on every account, most worthy of assiduous cultivation. It comprises that class of minor acts, so called, which makes up by far the greater part of the moral probation of most persons. The occasions for great and difficult virtue are rare, and the triumphs of a Christian man are not, ordinarily, to be won in any single memorable campaign, but in a constant succession of little conflicts, that require more circumspection and watchfulness, than courage or hardihood. It is in the affairs of the passing day and fleeting hour, — in the ordinary intercourse of business, — in our quiet relations with neighbours and friends, — in the noiseless paths of common life, — in its little vexations, disappointments, temptations, pains, and pleasures, — in the bosom of our families, and around the domestic fireside, — that we are, for the most part, to form and mature our characters.

So it is with the deterioration of our moral powers, and with the growth of sin. We must have been little observant of life, and very heedless of the teachings of our own personal experience, not to have learned, that a willing indulgence in any known fault, however slight we may venture to consider it, infallibly deadens the delicacy of our moral sense; impairs that "integrity" of aims, intention, and feeling, and that entireness of religious purpose, which alone "can preserve us," and thus leads the way to every subsequent step of moral degradation. It is not apocryphal as a maxim of life, however it may want canonical authority, that "he who contemneth small things, shall fall by little and little." "Oppose the first beginning of evil," is a rule of duty so fraught with practical wisdom, that it has gained a proverbial immortality on earth. The descent to moral ruin is not, commonly, by a sudden plunge, but by a gradual declension; and the most

abandoned being that now grovels there, if he could trace back the history of his sin and wretchedness, would find it beginning in some slight deviation; in some doubtful liberty; in some questionable indulgence; or in some wary or guarded yielding to the "voice of the charmer," which, at the time, seemed all but venial, or too trifling to be noted.

The same general principle is to be recognised in regard to what are commonly called Little Virtues. Not only is it true, that there is always more genuine religious principle in the silent, unobtrusive, unknown, habitual, conscientious fulfilment of the smaller duties of our place and station, than in the performance of those more signal acts, which the world, in the plenitude of its wisdom, commonly recognises as great; — but it is also to be remembered, that the pilgrimage of this world can only be accomplished by successive steps; and that habits, — those adamantine chains of the soul, — are formed by the repetition of single acts, each in itself so trifling as to escape remark; and that, therefore, if the great rules of Duty be not carried into their minute application among the small cares, unimportant engagements, trifling pleasures, humble aims, and "proximate purposes" of the passing hour, life and all its opportunities will be lost.

And a similar train of remark is applicable to the Smaller Trials, and Lesser Adversities to which we are exposed. These, whether they arise from our own or others' infirmities of temper or demeanor, or from cross and untoward events of comparatively little importance, or from the milder forms of suffering either of body or mind, will be found numerous and various beyond description. They meet us at every turn, they are with us at all hours, they assail us in the midst of our earnest efforts and leading purposes, and, still more, in our hours of repose, of negligent watching, and of strenuous idleness. They present themselves when they are least desired, and we least prepared for them; they make all the engagements and relaxations, all the circumstances and connexions of life, the medium of their approach; and cannot therefore be passed by, either wisely or safely, in any comprehensive scheme of duty or enjoyment.

We consider the part of the treatise before us relating to this subject as valuable, though we cannot but think that the long extract from Reinhard, marked as it is, by those all but endless divisions and subdivisions which are one of the

characteristics of this otherwise excellent thinker and writer, should have been curtailed or condensed in a work purporting to be original. This is followed by a quotation from Zollikoffer on the same subject, which, though also objectionable on the ground of its length, is yet so just and beautiful, that we should be unwilling to part with it. The admirable section of Fenelon, in his "Œuvres Spirituelles," on fidelity in small things, is also referred to, and might fitly, perhaps, have taken the place of both the former.

The peculiar *Situation* or *Condition* of man in this world, viewed as a subject of the Kingdom of God, the *Object* proposed to him in this relation, and the best *Mode* of fulfilling this object having been thus detailed, the author, in the fourth and last part of his treatise, proceeds to consider the "*Rules* and *Maxims* of a *Good Life;* that is to say, he intends to offer a representation or picture, under general heads, of that degree and style of excellence which seems competent to man, and which every human being, consequently, by a due use of his powers, is capable of realizing. . . . . The difference between the objects aimed at in the third and in this last part, is the same as between pointing out the path which must be followed, and giving such rules as may enable him, who is disposed to enter upon it, to pursue his course with steadiness and success." And, in order to avoid a vast number of particular rules, branched out under technical divisions, which are justly considered of very little practical use, since, if a disposition to conform to them already exists, they will not be needed, and, if it do not, they will not be consulted,— the Author, with the view of exhibiting such a picture of a good life as will present a clear idea to the reader, takes the *conduct of a day* as an illustration of his "Plan." He describes the natural expressions given to the different parts of a day by Nature herself, and indicates the corresponding style of conduct, by the exhibition of which, man should accommodate himself to the intimations of nature. We deem this part of the book eminently beautiful and valuable, and give an extract as a specimen, which is redolent of the very spirit of repose, calm thought, and solemn musing, which are in perfect keeping with the hour and place described.

"Evening. — Nature herself, as in the other seasons of the day, has given to this portion of it a character which significantly

points out the duties appropriate to it. The splendid light of day begins to decline; — a softer coloring spreads itself over the face of creation; — beauteous tints surround the path of the declining sun, — and heaven opens its resplendent glories to the eye and heart of man.

"The general duty appropriate to this season, like that of the morning, is that of a careful *composing* of the mind after the tumult and irritation of the day; — but the morning, as we formerly remarked, speaks chiefly of labors about to be executed, — while evening points more emphatically to those future and invisible issues to which all human labors are subservient. — Vol. II. pp. 330, 331.

Then, after speaking of "Serious Meditation," and careful "Self-Examination," as appropriate means of thus composing the mind, he proceeds:

"In the third place, *pleasing thoughts* respecting the beauty of Nature, and enjoyment of those lovely scenes, which the evening, in all countries, presents to the eye of man. This contemplation of the beautiful aspects of Nature may generally be best done by *solitary* musing; — but, to those who have been agitated or depressed by the contentions of the day, a more beneficial employment of the evening may sometimes be gained by a quiet enjoyment of rural wandering in the company of a friend. But, however indulged, this study of the aspects of Nature is one of the most healthful occupations, not for the body alone, but for the mind, in which we can be employed, — and the Author can state, from his own experience, that there is no occupation that will be recollected with more pure delight.

"A valley of much simple, but picturesque beauty, — a 'long-withdrawing vale,' — as the poet has characteristically expressed it, — marked by hoary ruins at one extremity, — and stretching towards the other, along the course of a winding stream, into a fine expanse of open and variegated country, characterizes his home. The landscape is bounded, at some distance, by a range of elegantly-formed and finely-verdured hills; — the whole forming one of those interesting, diversified, and extensive prospects, — with a rich and deep-set foreground, — a softer distance of wooded and upland country, — marked first by scattered country-seats, — and, farther west, by moorland farm-houses, — and, lastly, with the elegant but towering outline of its "boundary of hills," — which can be imaged only by those who have been accustomed from infancy to the picturesque forms of Scottish landscape, — or who have, at least, inhabited some district where Nature assumes her bolder

aspects, — and unites, in her creative but fantastic moods, the grandeur of mountain scenery with the rich setting of quiet valleys, or of softly-expanded landscape views.

"For years it has been the practice of the Author to enjoy the ever-changing beauty of this landscape, during a few moments of quiet contemplation, before beginning the business of the day, — and, indeed, in some of the first moments which the morning permits him to enjoy. And before 'the shades of evening fall' on the landscape, the same indulgence of quiet meditation on the forms and colors of Nature is repeated; no day, throughout the course of the year, presents the same aspect of this ever-lovely picture; — and whether these morning and evening studies be regarded as mere indulgences of taste, — as philosophical meditations, — or as pious communings with Nature, the image and visible expression of Nature's God, — the Author cannot help stating in this public manner, that there are no hours of his life which return to him with such a fresh and fondly-cherished relish of enjoyment, — or which he is more anxious to bring before the notice of his readers, — as a sample of the manner in which every one of them may most profitably and delightfully spend some portion of the hours of every day. There is no person who may not find some aspect of Nature, around his home, which may thus bring to him many 'sweet and healthful thoughts,' — and the remembrance of which may be a source of satisfaction and of great endearment to him, — throughout all the future years of his life." — *Ibid.* pp. 331 – 334.

These rules, which are adapted to the ordinary tenor of life, are varied to meet the exigences of those days, which, in the providence of God are peculiarly marked, and by which the uniform course of our existence is diversified. Thus, specific directions are given for the fitting use of days of Rejoicing, of Affliction, of peculiar Exertion, of Religious Exercises of the Sabbath, of Seasons devoted to the Remembrance of the leading Facts of Christianity and to a Review of Life.

These directions are rendered still more definite and available by considering man in the various relations he sustains to his immediate family; to his friends; to his neighbours; to the distressed; to wrong-doers; to society at large; and to the human race.

And, again, as life is presented to us, not merely in the detail of current hours, but as offering "General Appearances peculiar to each individual;" and as these are also to be taken into view in the conduct of a Good Life, they are here placed before us under the following relations; — the present condi-

tion of existence regarded as a Struggle for the mastery between the lower and higher powers of our nature; as a Scene of Labor and Care; as a Series of connected Events, involving Unexpected Issues; and as an Unfinished Scene.

The Treatise is concluded by certain "Estimates of Life," in reference to its happiness and misery, its Virtue and Vice; of the comparative Value of Melancholy or Cheerful Views of it; of the Heathen and Christian idea of a perfectly Good or Wise man; and of the relative Worth of the Argument for a Future State.

These topics are obviously too multifarious to admit of any condensed account, and too miscellaneous in their character to be properly illustrated by any extracts which could be crowded into our narrowing limits. They seem to us to present very sensible, judicious, and practical trains of remark; and, though they should be thought by any to be not very original or suggestive, or even to border sometimes on that large and well-frequented field of practical religion and ethics, which may be called common-place, yet it must be admitted that their spirit is generally benign, and their tendency always practically useful.

We have thus carefully followed our author over the broad ground of speculation and practice, which he has opened before us. It is broad indeed, since it embraces an enlarged and comprehensive estimate of that "KINGDOM OF GOD" of which man is a component part; of the "OBJECT," which, in consequence, is thus proposed to him; of the best "MODE" of accomplishing this object; and offers those "RULES and MAXIMS" OF A GOOD LIFE, which will enable him to carry this "mode" of conduct to the most successful issue. We hope to find some apology in this circumstance for the extent to which our own remarks have reached; if, indeed, an apology can ever be needed for any effort to make better known that most profound of all deep sciences, and most excellent of all good arts, the Science and the Art of Living Worthily and Well.

However this may be, we think it due to the writer of this treatise, before taking final leave of him; to bring into bold relief, and place prominently before our readers, what we deem to be the distinctive feature, and the especial excellence,—the "very head of the corner" of his "Living Temple." We

have already alluded to it in the extract which is placed at the commencement of these remarks. It is the *just estimate he has made of the duties of common life*, of the duties of that particular station in which every man finds himself placed in the present condition of things. This is kept continually in view. Every thing is brought to bear on this issue. It is the *axis* thought, so to speak, on which the author's whole scheme of Active and Social Duty turns.

In no one point, perhaps, are there such great speculative and practical mistakes, even among those who mean to be Christians, as in this. On the one hand, we see persons make religion to consist almost exclusively of the cultivation of certain states of feeling; viewing with great horror those influences which emanate from what they are pleased to call the "world"; detaching themselves, as far as possible, from all hearty concern and earnest participation in ordinary affairs; devoting themselves, often in a neglect of these interests, to a ceaseless round of religious services; hankering, with unappeasable desire, after religious excitements; and, in a word, acting continually on the principle, that the more they disengage themselves from things present, the more perfect is their preparation for things eternal.

This mistake existed, in analogous manifestations, in an Oriental Philosophy, long before the establishment of Christianity. And, in an especial manner, it dates back to a very early period in the history of this Spiritual Faith, and, in forms more or less modified by the progress of religious knowledge, has existed ever since, and will always be found the besetting infirmity of a certain order of minds. In former times, it led, as is well known, to an absolute seclusion from business; to a solitary life; to a denial of social engagements; to monkish seclusion; to an excessive multiplication of religious ceremonies; to pilgrimages; fasts; voluntary poverty; bodily maceration; and to other varieties of self-inflicted torture. And not a little of the same spirit may be seen, at the present day, in the conduct of those who have adopted certain mystical and fanatical views of religion, which in various forms are yet, unhappily, so widely prevalent. And there is one species of this mistake, which is not unfrequently made known to those intrusted with the religious confidence of others, which is greatly to be deplored. We mean a feeling more or less distinctly developed, which is seen to pervade the minds

of tender, susceptible, and serious persons, who are deeply impressed with a sense of their religious obligations, — namely, that there is something opposed or unfriendly to their spiritual progress, in those cares and duties, with which, for the most part, they are obliged, by their condition in life, to fill up their time and thoughts.

But common as these apprehensions are, and affecting and mournful as is the condition of many minds in consequence of them, they are altogether erroneous. No such necessary opposition between earth and heaven, things seen and things unseen, things temporal and things eternal, exists, or can exist. No such abstraction from ordinary calls and cares is required, or is permitted, in the religion of Jesus Christ. This life, with all its interests and engagements, is as much a part of the "Kingdom of God," as the life to come. He it is, as we have seen, who has placed us here, in the precise spot and sphere in which we find ourselves, with that peculiar environment of circumstances, which solicit or claim our attention; and it is here, and here alone, and by these especial means and opportunities, that our religious character is to be formed, our religious welfare secured.

How then, it may be asked, are those very numerous and prominent passages of the Christian Scriptures to be understood, which run thus: — "Set your affections on things above, not on things of the earth;" "Look not at the things which are seen and temporal, but at the things, which are unseen and eternal;" "Labor not for that meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life"? The New Testament is pervaded by language like this; — what does it mean?

It is obvious enough, in the first place, that these passages are not to be literally interpreted, since, in this sense, they are irreconcilable with various other passages which place life, and all it is and has, before us as solemn Trusts to be fulfilled, and make fidelity in a "few things," the condition of receiving "many things;" — irreconcilable with the present condition of life, which was an earlier revelation of God's will, than his recorded word; — and irreconcilable with the whole example of the Saviour, whose life was any thing almost, rather than a religious dream, a state of musing and abstraction, of mere contemplative piety and spiritual imaginings, and gave

absolutely no countenance to fevered and brain-sick excitements of any kind.

What then, the question recurs, is their true interpretation? Their general import is very plain. Taken in connexion with all those circumstances which illustrate their meaning, and viewed in reference to that whole train of reasoning which is fully developed in the treatise before us, we cannot doubt that they are intended, first, to meet and rebuke the natural propensity of our natures to become *engrossed* with present objects. They are to be considered as a strong reprehension of those who labor *only* for the "meat that perisheth" — who make the concerns of "this present" the *principal* object of pursuit. They forbid us to place our affections on things of the earth to the exclusion of things above; on things seen and temporal, so as to shut out of our view things unseen and eternal. And they are intended, in the next place, to direct our thoughts to the *ultimate aim*, the leading purpose, the prevailing object of an immortal being, — an immortal life. But, in thus giving a preëminence and ascendency to things future, they are not intended to call off our attention from things present, but simply to assign to these their proper place in the scheme of Duty. So far from considering these immediate objects and pursuits as unworthy of our attention, still less, as sinful in themselves, or unfriendly to moral and religious progress, they teach us to consecrate and hallow them all, as parts and means of a good and holy life. They are to be regarded as essentially belonging to one vast scheme of instruction and discipline, which, beginning on earth, is intended to lead us upward to heaven, and onward through eternity. The great duty is to employ them for this object; not to desert them; not to neglect them; not to undervalue them; not to fear them; — but to assign to them their true place and purpose; to consider them as trusts; and to employ them as faithful stewards, who hold themselves accountable for their best use. In fine, they are to be carefully attended to, regarded, valued, used, enjoyed, — but, be it always remembered, not for themselves alone, not as ultimate objects, but in subserviency, and in reference to those higher ends and aims, which centre on an eternal state. Thus are they brought within the scope of our religious obligations; thus are they rendered parts of a religious duty; thus are they all hallowed, — even the humblest and the meanest of them,

— hallowed, consecrated, sanctified, as parts of that "Kingdom of God," which our Saviour announced, labored and died to advance, and for the further advancement of which he has taught us to pray. Thus to use the things of time and sense; thus to view them in reference to the great ends they were intended to subserve; thus to make them means and agents in the formation of a high and pure religious character; thus to act "gracefully, conscientiously, kindly, and piously, even in trifles, and in the most common occupations of life;" thus to make the discharge of active offices a result and expression of Christian principles and sentiments, is to give to the Christian character its loveliest, noblest, and most perfect form.

But there is an error opposite to that now adverted to, not less gross, and yet most prevalent, and more dangerous to religious progress. We scarcely need say we refer to that of those, who, perceiving the mistake just referred to; seeing perhaps unworthy, or annoying, or ridiculous examples of it in their own daily walk, or beneath their own roof; and feeling strongly, moreover, the mischief and absurdity of neglecting ordinary claims and cares; pass over to the other extreme, and make these claims and cares, and a regular discharge of their common engagements, the whole sum and substance of human duty, — just as if all the pursuits of this life terminated in themselves, and were to be followed for themselves alone, and had no object, significance, or use beyond themselves. Examples of this extremely low, narrow, belittling view of human concerns, meet us at every turn.

Now both these errors, opposite as they are, come from a common source. And it is the peculiar, the distinctive praise of our author, that he has traced them both to their head-spring, and followed them into all their meanderings. There is no ethical treatise, within the compass of our reading, where this is so fully and faithfully done. Both errors, as is clearly shown, are to be referred to our ignorance or neglect of that intimate, necessary, indissoluble union, which exists between the things of time, and the things of eternity; between the duties which belong to this life, and the condition of another; between the sentiments and principles which belong to us as men, citizens, friends, husbands, wives, parents, children, brothers and sisters, and the sentiments and principles which belong to us distinctively as

Christians. But this is to mistake, as we have already had occasion to observe, a mere verbal distinction, adopted for the sake of perspicuity in language, for an essential difference. No such difference does or can exist. Christian graces, if the term have any definite or intelligible meaning, are certain dispositions of the soul, and moral and religious acts are nothing less than these dispositions carried into effect. The two classes of duties, if we must continue to employ the phrase, are, in their very nature inseparable; nay, they are identically the same, and they are not to be disunited even so much as in thought. Those principles and sentiments, which are commonly considered as being peculiarly religious, will be but imperfectly developed, if they be not carried into action in the midst of the ordinary duties and cares of life. This is their appropriate sphere. Here, and here alone, are they to be improved and perfected. And on the other hand, these ordinary cares and duties are all to be met and fulfilled under the guidance and influence of those religious principles and sentiments. It is thus and only thus, that they can be well performed, devoted to holy uses, and made to become parts and aids of the Christian character. And when thus performed, when thus done in reference to our religious obligations here, and to our spiritual destination hereafter, when thus done in a *proper spirit*, — we hesitate not to say, that we cannot devote ourselves *too earnestly* to *present objects*.

Who then is the Worldly-minded man? It is not necessarily he, who gives himself with earnestness and fidelity to the concerns of this world; for this it is every man's duty to do, and is, moreover, the means, and the only means, as it has been fully shown, of preparing for another world. But it is he, who gives himself exclusively to present interests, who pursues them without any reference to their connexion with his future well-being, who makes them the sole and all-absorbing objects of pursuit, whose thoughts and labors centre upon them as final results. This is the worldly-minded man. This is the true child of earth. He is thoroughly of the earth, earthy; and in this earthliness of all his desires, feelings, pursuits, plans, and objects, he has no more interest, or care, or claim on the future world, than if a God-inspired soul had never been breathed into him, and a future world had never been revealed.

And who, again, is the Heavenly-minded man? It is not,

necessarily, he who is exclusively employed in thinking on heavenly themes; nor he who detaches himself from all interest in present things, that he may become wholly absorbed in things future; nor he who retires from the incumbent duties of his condition in the present state, that he may bury himself in religious musings, and spiritual abstractions, and devotional services, — since this is to desert the sphere in which Providence has placed him, to neglect the duties which his great Task-master has assigned to him, and to bury the talent that was committed to his keeping; and it will signify nothing that it is inhumed in what he may deem to be consecrated earth. Still less is he a heavenly-minded man, who, shutting up all his sympathies and charities within the enclosure of his own narrow creed, makes it his sole business to thrust this creed upon all within his reach, and, in his proselyting rage, frightens away, by his noise and violence, all the sweet Christian graces, and outrages all the common proprieties and decencies of life. This is any thing but heavenly-mindedness. But he is entitled to this high distinction, who, under a deep impression of his religious accountability, and a conviction that he is acting beneath the inspection of God, his present Witness and future Judge, faithfully, kindly, considerately, generously, honorably, attends to every incumbent duty of his place and station in life; enjoys, with a glad and grateful heart, all its innocent pleasures; and feels that he cannot be too earnestly devoted to each and all of these present interests; provided he regards them as parts of that divine discipline, which is to prepare him for higher truth and better enjoyments in those more glorious developements of God's all-comprehending kingdom, which are not yet revealed to mortal eyes.

The author dwells, much at large, on the uses and benefits of this view of human duty. We cannot now even glance at them in detail. There are two especial advantages, however, which it presents to us, that we deem too important to be wholly passed over. One is, that it gives a *definite aim* to conduct. If we could look into the minds of many persons, who are sincerely desirous of forming a religious character, and of living a religious life, we should find that their notions are extremely vague concerning what is required of them as religious beings. They are subject to a continual struggle between an impression, not easily dismissed, of the im-

portance of the engagements of this present state, and that supremacy of regard which they cannot but feel to be due to things eternal. They are continually striving after a spiritual state and condition of character, of which they have no distinct conception, but which they apprehend to be something wholly distinct from that palpable and visible scene of things in which they are placed. But in the "plan" here given, a definite object is proposed as the leading aim of existence; and this is the continual improvement of all our capacities, in the use and by means of all the duties and circumstances of our condition, under an habitual impression of our religious responsibleness, and in the full developement of our religious natures. This aim evidently embraces all minor aims; as there is no spiritual state or condition of character, that is, or can, or ought to be obtained, which is distinct from present objects and engagements, since, be it repeated once more, it is precisely *in*, and *by*, and *through* these, that a truly spiritual state of character is to be formed.

The other advantage referred to, is this. It brings all the employments, duties, business, and true pleasures of life into one harmonious scheme, and consecrates them all to religious uses. And in nothing is this more delightfully apparent, than in the *small duties* and minor engagements of life. These, in the estimate of those persons whose religious systems lead them to separate religion from morality, spiritual culture from actual, every-day duties, are considered as hindrances and interruptions to their religious progress, and they are seen avoiding and neglecting them, that they may give an unbroken attention to services, which they deem more specifically religious, and by which alone, or principally, a religious character can be formed. But in the view here presented, all the incumbent duties of life, the small as well as the great, nay, even the most trivial and unimportant, are equally parts of one great scheme of religious advancement. All are comprehended in the vast plan. The unobtrusive virtues and quiet graces of humble life; faithful, pains-taking cares for subsistence; the education of those committed to our trust; the care of our families; the promotion of order, peace, and concord in the sphere of our influence, however narrow; kindness and fidelity in the circle of our social and domestic relations, however small; faithfulness in every duty, however humble; patience and acquiescence under the lesser

crosses and slighter ills of life; cheerfulness and gratitude in the reception of the smallest pleasures that shine out upon us, like transient sunbeams, in the dark and weary path of humble toil; all the good that we have, or can impart to others, however trifling it may appear; — all are rendered religious acts, all receive a high consecration, all are illumined with the light of a purer and brighter world, by being used by us as a part, and an important part, of our duty as members of the universal "kingdom of God," and in habitual subserviency to those aims and hopes, that centre upon an Everlasting Life.

> "And oh! when nature shrinks, as oft she may,
> Through long-lived pressure of obscure distress,
> Still to be strenuous for the bright reward,
> And in the soul admit of no decay,
> Brook no continuance of weak-mindedness, —
> Great is the glory, for the strife is hard."

J. B.

Art. III. — *An Impartial Exposition of the Evidences and Doctrines of the Christian Religion, addressed to the better educated Classes of Society, by* J. H. McCulloh, Jr., M. D., Author of "Researches, Philosophical and Antiquarian, concerning the Aboriginal History of America." Baltimore: Armstrong & Berry. 1836. 8vo. pp. 346.

It is not often that we are presented with a theological treatise by a layman; not so often as we could wish. There are reasons why we should regard such productions with peculiar interest. Though usually less furnished with theological learning, laymen possess some decided advantages for religious investigation. They can speak out without fear of a congregation, presbytery, bishop, or synod; and though they cannot be supposed to be so far exempt from the common weaknesses of our nature as to be free from all party biases, they are certainly less liable to partiality than the professed divine, who must be supposed to be enlisted by connexion, by interest, or by sympathy on one side or the other of the great questions which divide the Christian church.

These considerations apply with peculiar force to a work on

the Evidences. What has a layman to gain by vindicating the truth of Christianity? His temporal interests are not at all at stake. His pride cannot be enlisted to establish the respectability of that which makes him respectable. We are disposed, then, to receive what he says as his simple and honest convictions, which he promulgates to the world, only because he deems them true and important.

Another consideration, which makes lay theology peculiarly worthy of regard, is the fact, that the clergy, as a body, are apt to lag behind the people in the march of opinion. Such has been hitherto the organization of church establishments, that it has been unsafe for the clergy, either to examine for themselves, or to avow their opinions. It is certainly folly, — when a man's opinions have been manufactured to his hand by some provident council ages ago, and he has pledged himself to maintain them at all events, — to go over again the grounds on which they are understood to rest. If he comes to the same result, he only believes *with* evidence what he before believed *without*. If he comes to a different conclusion, he has condemned himself to be either a heretic or a hypocrite for the rest of his life. The clergy, therefore, need occasionally to hear some awakening note from the people to urge them forward, or at least to save them from being left entirely in the rear.

We repeat it, therefore, we are glad to see such books as this. We are glad to see a full, free, independent expression of individual opinion. It is in this way alone, that any thing valuable can be added to theological knowledge. The repetition of other men's ideas, the emptying of one book into another, does us no good. Let every man state precisely what is in his own mind. No matter if it be eccentric or paradoxical, provided that it is sincerely held, and has been well considered. Let him give us the impressions which any subject makes on his own intellect, and then we have another independent suffrage, or at least one more distinct intellectual phenomenon, to further our investigation of truth.

The treatise under review had its origin, as the author states in his Preface, in parental solicitude.

"When I first undertook to write the following Essay, I had no intention whatever of making it public. I was solely influenced by the suggestions of parental solicitude to prepare something that should assist my own children to the better comprehension of

a subject, which I deemed of all others most important. But, when the work was nearly finished, it seemed to me that its publication could not but have a beneficial influence at the present time, when the institutions of the civilized world seem to be on the eve of a great change, in which new opinions must subvert ancient prejudices, and society be regulated by a theory of principles very different from those, which have hitherto influenced the interests of mankind." — p. v.

We are glad that he has published his thoughts. As yet, it is true, they have not made much noise except in his own immediate vicinity, and probably never will make much. They present, nevertheless, a sufficiently clear and able exposition of a state of mind on religious subjects by no means peculiar to the Author, but common to a large number of religious and inquiring laymen throughout the country, who, like him, still continue attached to Orthodox churches, though they have renounced Orthodoxy itself, and are feeling about, with such helps as they can command, to find some other and better foundation of trust. The volume is interesting and valuable, therefore, as indicating a change which is everywhere passing over intelligent and active minds among the Orthodox, not professionally fettered, and the direction which this change is beginning to take ; and it is chiefly on this account, that we are led to notice it so much at length in this journal.

The plan here pursued in the discussion of the Christian Evidences, though not new, differs from the common one. Most writers on this subject have availed themselves of whatever assistance they supposed might be derived to our faith, from Natural Religion and man's moral constitution. Butler, Locke, Hartley, Clarke, Priestley (who professes to have derived most of his principles on the subject from Hartley), Jenyns, Paley, and very lately Lord Brougham, have all considered the cause of revealed religion to be strongly corroborated by what we know of God and duty by the light of nature. Our author finds this ground preoccupied by the Deists. Here they have entrenched themselves, and here they have erected their batteries against Christianity. They say, that revelation cannot be true, because it contains things which are inconsistent with the moral attributes of God, and the immutable distinctions of moral propriety established in the mind of man. Before any progress can be made in demonstrating the truth of Christianity, these assailants must

be dislodged and discomfited. And this he attempts to do, not by reconciling with what are called the principles of Natural Theology and the moral sense, those parts of the Scriptures to which the Deists object as being inconsistent with them, but by annihilating the ground on which they stand, and utterly denying that Natural Religion teaches us any thing with regard to God's *moral* attributes, and that our own moral constitution is any criterion by which to judge of the propriety or impropriety of the acts of the Diety. To this purpose more than a hundred pages are devoted before he proceeds to the direct proof. This he rests entirely on the credibility of the sacred writers as witnesses of a supernatural interposition to enlighten mankind. From the Scriptures, and from the Scriptures alone, he thinks, do we derive any evidence of the moral attributes of the Deity, and from them alone do we derive any moral distinctions, which are of sufficient authority to be applied as a test to the propriety of his moral actions. Whether he has done wisely in thus thinking to annihilate Natural Religion, the reader must judge.

Our Author begins by observing:

"Now before we can undertake to estimate the truth or falsehood of Christianity, it is of essential importance, that we first ascertain the actual value of the principles by which we are to make our decision. In other words we must accurately determine the following particulars:

"What is the actual amount of knowledge, that we derive from the study of Natural Theology?

"What is the actual value of those principles, that constitute the Theory of Natural Religion?

"What is the true theory of Moral Distinctions, *i. e.* what is it that makes one action to be right and another wrong?

"What is it that constitutes a man a credible witness, and what is it that makes us mistrust and reject the testimony of another?" — p. 24.

He then proceeds to estimate the value of the dogmas, as he calls them, which constitute Natural Religion.

"Our actual knowledge concerning the origin of religious dogmas, may be stated in a few words. The past history of mankind, exclusive of the Bible, does not communicate to us any information, how the theory of religious obligation has originated. The most ancient records of human transactions, in every instance, exhibit mankind as then living under the influence of religious

institutions, and the latest discoveries of modern enterprise, in hitherto unexplored regions of the earth, inform us of a similar religious condition of things, with every newly discovered nation. Hence it seems to be incontestable, that no nation, or people, have ever yet been discovered, who were destitute of the theory of religious obligation, and of which the following are the essential dogmas.

"1st. That there are gods, creators, and governors of the world, who rule all things, with both general and particular providence.

"2d. That all men are responsible beings before the gods, and accountable for their actions.

"3d. That the soul of man is immortal, and that, after the death of the body, it shall exist in either happiness or misery, according to the manner they may have lived in the present life."

. . . . . "Instead of speculating how these dogmas originated among men, we shall alone inquire into the value of the proofs or arguments by which they are sustained." —p. 29.

These dogmas, to our great surprise, our Author, with the exception of the first, finds altogether unsupported by the appearances of the universe. After a labored discussion he comes to these conclusions concerning them, to our mind, we must confess, most extraordinary.

"1st. That our universe, and all it contains, is the production of intelligent power, but whether of one or more gods we cannot determine.

"2d. Of this god, or gods, we have not the smallest idea, except that he, or they, possess great power and intelligence; and it may be important to add, we are altogether unable to discern their possession of excellent attributes, such as benevolence, mercy, justice, &c.

"3d. We are unable to perceive, that the moral affairs of human life are superintended by any particular providence, and that universal experience opposes such a notion.

"4th. That there is not only no proof, but on the contrary it is against all fact, and the evidence of our senses, to believe that the intelligent principle of man is immortal, and consequently we have not the smallest reason to justify the theory of future reward or punishment. —p. 73.

Of these striking conclusions we have space to examine but one, and that is the proof of the Divine benevolence. This, every one must perceive, depends on the apparent predominance of happiness or misery, in those beings that are made capable of both.

"Now," says our author, "with respect to mankind, there can be no dispute, that human life is so much embittered by sorrow, affliction, and pain, so much by tyranny and oppression, so much by poverty and disease, that, in all ages, every moral writer whatever has exhibited human nature as being essentially unhappy; and death, however much we dread his approach, has ever been regarded as our great deliverer from the troubles of human life. The Scriptures decidedly take the same view, and, in short, none but certain advocates of natural theology, hold any other language on the question of fact." . . . . . "As he (God) is, by his visible works, possessed of infinite power and intelligence, so, as he has not appointed a happy state and condition to human existence, it follows that we have no reason whatever to consider him good, from any view derivable from our experience of his providence." —pp. 46, 47.

He also contends, that, "with respect to the brute animals, a stronger position against the theory of the divine goodness may be sustained." And, in another place, he thus concludes; "If a man will have a positive dogma on the subject of the nature and attributes of the Creator, he can come to no other conclusion, reasoning only from nature and experience, than that the Deity was totally indifferent to human and animal happiness."

The facts here assumed, it will be perceived, rest entirely on individual opinion, an opinion which we confess we had never before either seen or heard expressed, except it may be in some moment of great suffering or passionate grief. The conclusions, then, which are drawn from them, will be satisfactory only to those, and we cannot help hoping they will be but a small number, who coincide with him in this opinion. But, supposing it proved that the Creator is "totally indifferent" to the happiness of his creatures, and man especially, —nay, more than this, that suffering actually preponderates, and, therefore, as our author has cut off all consideration of any compensation in a future state, that the balance inclines rather to the side of his malevolence; — this being proved, we seriously would inquire, if the foundations of revelation as well as natural religion be not equally shaken. It immediately establishes a presumption against a revelation. If God be "totally indifferent" to human welfare, it becomes improbable that he would make a revelation at all, if its purpose be to do man good; —much more, if he be in any degree malevolent. Besides, unless you consider the goodness of the Deity, and

his care for human happiness, to be proved by the light of nature, how can you possibly prove the truth of revelation ; — we do not here mean that it is a revelation, but that what is revealed is *true? You can place no dependence on the divine veracity.* Veracity is certainly a moral attribute ; and our author denies, that we can know any thing of the moral attributes of God by the light of nature. Veracity, moreover, in this case is blended with the divine goodness, and that, he says, has no evidence in nature. A God whose moral attributes are by supposition unknown, and who is "indifferent" to the happiness of mankind, would be quite as likely to deceive them in a revelation, as to create them in a condition "essentially unhappy." Are we told that the Scriptures assert that God is true, and therefore his veracity may be proved from them? We answer, that this assertion makes a part of that very revelation, the truth of which cannot be proved, except by assuming as proved or made probable from some other source, that God himself is true. It is to be feared then, we think, that our author has made too great a sacrifice in order to silence the infidel objections derived from natural religion. *In giving up the moral attributes of the Deity as being antecedently unknown, and indiscoverable by the light of nature, he has abandoned the only ground on which revelation itself can be defended.*

Our author next proceeds to dispose of the objections brought by the Deists against the Scriptures, from what they call the immutability of moral distinctions. They say that the God of the Scriptures is represented in the Scriptures to have done this and that, which contradict our ideas of moral propriety, and therefore they are to be rejected as coming from him. This objection, which is similar to the last, he disposes of in much the same manner. He meets it by saying, that our ideas of moral propriety are relative only to ourselves, and totally inapplicable to the Deity ; and therefore we have no right to say that any thing whatever which has been done, or is said to have been done by him, is either right or wrong. He sums up the argument in the following manner.

"Then all that we claim for Christianity is, that it shall not be supposed condemnable for any statement it has made concerning Jehovah, or his proceeding with mankind, on the very intelligible ground, that we know nothing whatever concerning his nature and

attributes." . . . . . "Every attempt to estimate the morality of God's act, by what is called the immutability of moral distinctions, has never failed in a single instance to end in error, folly, and mischief." . . . . . "All that moralists have ever written on the subject of moral obligations, extends to no system more universal than is embraced by the word Philanthropy. Virtue and morality, justice, right, &c., are mere synonymes with philanthropy, and it is impossible for us to give them any other universality." — pp. 103, 92, 91.

We shall attempt briefly to examine the correctness of these positions. In the first place we observe, that they take for granted the truth of a hypothesis, which, to say the most, has as yet gained but few suffrages, and which seems to us to be positively false ; namely, that utility is not only the foundation of morality, and the safe and proper one for men to adopt when they come to years of discretion ; but that it is constituted the standard in the human mind from the first, — the first and only criterion by which the mind judges any act to be right or wrong. This, we repeat, we do not believe to be a fact. Of this every human being is a sufficient judge. He has only to ask himself, if to perceive any action to be calculated to promote the enjoyment of another, be the same as to perceive it to be right ? Is not the simple perception of right and wrong in the mind long antecedent to the complex perception of an action's being calculated to produce good on the whole ? Does not the child's consciousness of the criminality of lying, long precede his knowledge of the social evils, which at length grow out of it ?

Benevolence or philanthropy, so far from being the supreme authority of the mind, and the standard of action, is no authority at all. It is a motive, an affection, and belongs rather to the heart than the mind. It has a power above it, to which it is subjected, instead of reigning supreme, — this very sense of right and wrong. And we have no other evidence that it is good to be benevolent, except this very sense of right and wrong, which assures us that benevolence is right and malevolence is wrong. It is not a fact then, that all moral principle can be resolved into philanthropy. That God has so constituted the moral sense, that its instinctive judgments shall coincide with the greatest good of the human race, we do not deny. Such an ordination corresponds to that wisdom which forms the embryo bird or fish for the

element in which it is afterward to live. But that the perception of that good is the ground and constituent element of the moral sense, we utterly deny.

Whether right and wrong can be made universals or not, or whether they must be confined to the transactions and relations between man and man, will appear, if we analyze the ideas contained in this distinction, and consider what they imply. They imply an agent, with perception, choice, power, intention, and some sentient being to suffer or enjoy. Now, for one being to destroy the happiness of another being when innocent, strikes our minds as unjust, morally wrong. We know of no exception to this. The idea that it is wrong and unjust to make an innocent being miserable, on the whole, is as self-evident as that two and two make four. And it makes no difference whether the agent be God or man. It is impossible for us to view it in any other light. The circumstances of absolute property, and resistless power, make no difference. Might cannot make right, in the divine, any more than it can in human governments. Let the case but fairly be made out, and the mind decides as promptly in the one case as in the other.

It would not be a satisfactory answer then to the Deist, nor a fair one, when he objects that there are things in the Bible represented to have been done by the Deity which cannot be reconciled with our moral sense, to say that we know nothing as to what would be right or wrong in the Divine conduct. Our author's argument covers every possible supposition, and must be equally good in every supposable case. No matter what tissue of moral obliquity a revelation may charge upon God, it is all the same. He gives, then, the Deist, all he asks; a case utterly irreconcilable. All we can say then is, that the matter is brought to this dilemma, supposing such an indisputable case can be found in the Scriptures; — either that the God of the Scriptures is not good, or that the revelation does not come from him. Take the latter alternative, and its authority is gone of course. Take the former, and it is equally destroyed; for a revelation from a Being not good, can have no claim to our trust. Is it said that these Scriptures *assert* that he is good, and their assertion must be emphatically received as true? We answer, if they contain records of transactions on his part utterly irreconcilable with goodness, as the Deists affirm, and our

author supposes possible, then they likewise assert or imply that he is *not* good, and so contradict themselves, and thus neutralize their own authority.

Unless there be some fallacy in the preceding arguments, we fear we shall be compelled to conclude that the Deist's hands would be strengthened, instead of being palsied, by the proposed annihilation and abandonment of natural religion, and the denial of the applicability of moral distinctions to the Deity. And, if this be the case, we see not how we can avoid the conclusion, that the first hundred pages of the book have carried the author to a greater distance from his object, than he was when he commenced.

The next two chapters relate to the nature of the evidence by which the Scriptures are sustained as a Divine revelation. This he considers to rest on one point, the *credibility* of the writers. "In conformity with opinions already announced on a preceding page, I reiterate the belief, that the only sure argument upon which we can receive the Christian religion as a Divine institution, depends upon the absolute credibility of the biblical writers. If we can prove them absolutely free from every imputation of knavery and fraud, I cannot see how their testimony can be rejected."

There is much valuable matter in these chapters, particularly on the subject of miracles. We have never seen this subject yet set in its true and proper light. "Since a past miracle can have no argument or demonstration of its truth embodied in itself, but is absolutely dependent on historic relation, I apprehend they cannot in themselves be brought forward as matters of evidence to us at the present day. Their whole force, as divine evidence, appears to have been exhausted on the eye-witnesses." And yet we suppose the writer would agree with the Apostle, that, if Christ be not risen, our faith is vain, and Christianity a delusion. What ground then do they occupy? We confess we have never seen this subject thoroughly investigated. We are disposed, however, to give "credibility" of the witnesses a much wider signification than our author. He makes it to rest exclusively on their honesty and disinterestedness. We apprehend that he has confounded two things here, which it is necessary to keep distinct; because the mind always does so in weighing testimony. This distinction is between the credibility of the witnesses, and the credibility of the facts to which they

testify, as supported by their testimony. This latter depends, in a great measure, on the nature of the facts themselves, their antecedent probability, their consistency with the known laws of nature, and with each other. Thus, when we read the testimonies of the Apostles concerning Christ, we do not look solely at the apparent sincerity and honesty which they exhibit, but likewise at the intrinsic probability and consistency of their narrative. We cannot keep out of our mind the probability or improbability of God's making a revelation at all, at such a time and such a place, the character of Christ and his religion, and other particulars of the same general description. These are considerations, which we cannot possibly separate from our estimate of the credibility of the facts, even if we would. When, therefore, our author asserts, that he rests the truth of Christianity on the honesty and disinterestedness of the witnesses, he must be understood as expressing only an individual opinion, stating merely what seems the strong point to *him*.

And this leads us to express a conviction long entertained, and which this publication has contributed to strengthen, of the almost entire inutility of one man's writing books of Evidences for another, and almost, indeed, of writing books of Evidences at all. The evidences are plainly cumulative in their nature, and are most convincing, when viewed by the mind at once, and are rather weakened when separately discussed. Bacon's censure of the Schoolmen applies here with the greatest force. "Questionum minutiis scientiarum frangunt soliditatem." "Considered as a whole," he proceeds to say, "like the fabled Scylla, it seems beautiful and specious; but when you descend into distinctions, it ends in monstrous altercations and barking questions."

One argument strikes one, and another another. More than a hundred years ago, Locke wrote a book to show that Christianity was to be believed because it is reasonable. A half-century later Soame Jenyns wrote another, to show that it is to be believed because it is unreasonable, so utterly contradictory to the principles of the human understanding, that the mind of man could never have invented it. Lord Brougham, on the other side of the Atlantic, publishes a book in which he asserts, that miracles even cannot substantiate a revelation which contradicts the principles of Natural Religion. Almost simultaneously a book comes out in America,

which annihilates Natural Religion altogether, and denies that it has a single dogma of sufficient certainty to form a criterion by which to judge of the claims of a revelation. It is plain, that no progress can be made in this way in the conviction of skeptics. They have only to set the different defenders of the cause to quarrelling with each other, and thus neutralize their authority. Let each state his own grounds, but let him not attempt to invalidate the arguments of the other. Let them do so, and this very fact, that there are so many independent minds, convinced by independent arguments, will show the richness and variety of the evidence, and thus demonstrate, that, when aggregated instead of divided, it must be absolutely overwhelming.

The Bible, if it be from God, we may be sure, addresses men in the best possible manner; and if it does not convince them, just as it is, it must arise from some mental or moral obliquity, which argumentation will be the last thing to cure. And, paradoxical as it may seem, we believe that discourses on the Evidences are generally among the most useless which fall from our pulpits, even in congregations where doubt is most prevalent. They suggest two objections where they answer one, and are almost always found, in the end, to unsettle many more minds than they confirm.

We do not, of course, mean to say, that there is any deficiency in the evidence by which revelation is supported; we speak merely of the mode and need of its formal exhibition and examination. "*The whole need not a physician, but those that are sick.*" As for those whose faith has been disturbed by deistical books or arguments, they may be occasionally benefited by books of Evidences. Still we believe the great battle is fought over the sacred pages, with very little foreign aid. The process through which the commonest mind passes, is strictly philosophical; quite as much so, as if guided by the greatest masters of formal logic. It is, we believe, something like this. "Here is a book *unique* in every particular. Its doctrines concerning the Divine Nature are immeasurably more pure and exalted, than those of any other book or system of religion that the world has else exhibited. Its doctrines concerning our moral and spiritual nature find a witness in the inner man, of their truth. Humanity, under its auspices, rises to a purity, strength, perfection, and happiness, unimagined even by the human mind without it. The God

which it reveals is the same God we see in nature, and is represented to have interrupted the laws of nature in order to give man evidence of his interposition, in a manner not unsuited to the dignity and benevolence of his character. We see, moreover, in the character of Christ, a moral miracle, quite as striking as any change in the physical universe could be. These are actual facts, phenomena, presented to the mind for its explanation. It must have some theory of their origin. Which is the most probable, revelation or fiction?" Now we aver, that no book ever has exhibited, or ever can exhibit these considerations with the force, and comprehensiveness, and concentration, with which they are presented by the Bible itself. The famous treatise of Dr. Paley, concerning "the labors, dangers, and sufferings of the Apostles," as utterly fails of bringing before the mind the broad and general grounds of belief in Christianity, as a narrow arm of the sea fails of exhibiting the vastness and depth of the ocean. We doubt whether one reader in ten of that book ever thought of resting his faith on that individual point, on which he lays the whole stress.

The most substantial and valuable part of this book is the chapters on the constitution of the Jewish church and state. Much of this is certainly new and very ably handled. The author shows conclusively, from the independence of the orders of the Priests, the Prophets, and the Kings on each other, that there is absolutely no room for suspicion of collusion and fraud. We commend these chapters to all thinking men, and especially to the clergy, as containing much that will strike them as fresh and valuable.

Our readers will be curious, we suppose, to know what our author, having proved the truth of revelation, considers it to teach. This division, on Doctrines, though not the most important, is certainly the most curious part of the work. If the opinions there expressed may be considered, and we are inclined to think they may be, as the index of progress of mind on these subjects in this country among men of information, they lead us to some gratifying conclusions. The position occupied by our author may be pretty well calculated, when we say, that he discards the doctrines of Original Sin and the Trinity. Indeed, we have never seen the doctrine of Original Sin more lucidly and ably refuted.

"That all men," he says, "without exception, are more or less sinful in their lives before Jehovah, arises not from any inherent taint or corruption, such as is imagined by the theory of Original Sin, but from the fact that we are intellectual and moral beings *of an imperfect constitution, undergoing a probationary discipline before him as free agents.* As such, exercised on the perfect law of Jehovah, we sometimes do right, and sometimes we do wrong. How could it be otherwise? The very theory of our probation anticipates our disobedience as well as our obedience. What else could be expected of free agents under trial? If any man could keep the law of Jehovah *perfectly*, he is a perfect being, and no longer in an imperfect condition." — p. 271.

"If Adam and Eve fell without any taint of Original Sin, why should our transgressions be considered a proof of the existence of Original Sin in us? Adam and Eve's transgression was not less in its moral obliquity than any of our offences. If they therefore sinned without Original Sin, it never can be inferred that our transgressions proceed from that source." — p. 267.

"With this plain exhibition of the fallacy of the doctrine of Original Sin, I apprehend that we are not required to discourse at large upon predestination, election, effectual calling, perseverance of the saints, and sundry other doctrines growing out of the theory of Original Sin. These all fall together by the exposition we have made above; for they are not taught in the Scriptures, and are but doctrines of men made through unjustifiable inferences." — pp. 274, 275.

On the doctrine of the Trinity he is equally explicit. Though he refuses to speculate, he rejects this doctrine as not contained in Scripture.

"Nothing can be clearer, nor more distinctly expressed in the Scripture, than that God, meaning thereby Jehovah, is one. — THERE IS BUT ONE GOD. — This is also the doctrine of the Trinitarians; there is but one God, though there are three persons in the Godhead.

"But, do the Scriptures anywhere use the word *Trinity?* Do the Scriptures anywhere say, there are three persons in the Godhead? No, not in a single text, for the oft-quoted passage of 1 John v. 7, has been, long since, shown to be a corruption, and is admitted to be so by all the more eminent critics of the present day.

"The doctrine of the Trinity, then, is one which men have inferred from the Scripture writings, and is not a doctrine of formal revelation." — p. 278.

A person, who had been accustomed to divide the Christian world into two classes, Unitarians and Trinitarians, would have no hesitation, we imagine, in placing the writer of the above in the former class, but in the following paragraphs he would find himself corrected.

"But if the doctrine of the Trinitarians be presumptuous and contrary to the exhibition of the Scripture writings, what must we say of that of the Socinians or modern Unitarians? I am at a loss how to express myself upon this subject; on the one hand they profess to found their belief on the Scriptures, and largely quote it to prove their doctrine. On the other hand, as I understand the Scriptures, I have no hesitation in stating my opinion, that their expositions and doctrine, in its important features, are directly contrary to the whole scope and tenor of the Scripture writings. I have no right to impugn the honesty or sincerity of the Socinians, but I am perfectly at a loss how to reconcile their opinions with the Scriptures. Judging by the light of my own understanding and conscience, I do consider the doctrines of modern Unitarians to be entirely subversive of the Christian religion, so far as I can comprehend the subject; and, this being the case, I will not hesitate to bear my testimony against such opinions. If the Scriptures do teach us, and I am clear on this point, that salvation from our sins is only to be attained through the sacrificial death of Jesus Christ, and in virtue of that intercession that he makes continually with the Father for us, so I cannot consider the Unitarian doctrine other than an absolute departure from the theory of the Scriptures, and a formal rejection of that salvation which God has freely offered to us. To reject the mode that God has appointed, leaves no alternative and no hope. What then shall the end of this be?

"In the course of a very general reading upon the moral and religious speculations of men, I have been often disturbed by the extreme difference that sometimes existed between their views and my own, but with none have I been so much disposed to lose patience as with the Socinian writings. The excellent Archbishop Tillotson, on one occasion, speaks of Socinus as 'a great master of reason,' and which I shall concede to be the fact from such commendation, for I have never seen his works; but I defy any other sect of Christians, except the Unitarians, to read the works of Priestly [Priestley], of Belsham, Evanson, and other of their champions, without being amazed at their reasons, and shocked with their apparent presumption.

"But though I consider the Trinitarian doctrine to want Scriptural authority, and that of the Socinians to be altogether con-

tradictory to the Scriptures, I cannot advocate the hypothesis of the Arians. I cannot but consider it presumptuous to determine so incomprehensible a subject according to any hypothesis." — pp. 280, 281.

We had hitherto supposed that all possible opinions concerning the nature and dignity of Christ were comprehended under the three denominations of Unitarian, Arian (which is in reality Unitarian), and Trinitarian. But here is attempted, not a *tertium*, but a *quartum quid*, irreducible to any known category, because undefined. How far it may be possible for a human mind to think of Christ at all without assigning him any specific rank in the universe, we shall not assume the province of determining. If we examine the thing a little closer, we shall find that our author has a greater dread of heretical *names* than heretical sentiments. For, while he denies the Trinity, he denounces the Unitarians; and, while he disclaims the name of Arian, he hesitates not to advance Arian opinions, for in one place he expresses himself thus; — "Jesus Christ, whom he of his infinite mercy sent into the world from a state of preëxisting glory, that we might be saved from our sins." Now how a man, who entertains such an opinion, can be other than an Arian of some species, as that term is commonly received, we confess ourselves unable to see. And, what is still more surprising, in advancing this sentiment we find him treading the very ground which he has forbidden to others, founding doctrines on inferences. It is nowhere expressly asserted that Christ existed in a previous state of glory. Robert Hall, one of the most able, earnest, and, we may add, bitter advocates of the doctrine of the Trinity, admits that it is merely a doctrine of inference, except in one passage, — "Before Abraham was, I am," — and this passage, when examined, will be found to have quite as great ambiguity as the rest. It does not positively assert that Christ existed before Abraham, because the verb is in the present tense. It may not be a verb of existence at all, but only of affirmation, and used, just as it is in other cases, with the ellipsis of *he*, or the *Messiah;* as when he says, "If ye believe not that I am, ye shall die in your sins;" that is, "that I am *he*," or the Messiah. It may mean, therefore, according to the current use of language in the Scriptures, that Jesus was personally promised, or designated in the counsels of Jehovah, as the Messiah, before the days of Abraham.

Biblical criticism is not a subject with which we have a right to expect a layman to be intimately acquainted. From the specimens we have of it in this book, we should hardly suppose the author to have examined this subject with sufficient accuracy to justify a positive, not to say, dogmatic opinion upon it. For in the very paragraph, in which he speaks of the preëxistent glory of Christ, he quotes the Scripture as saying, "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the Lord Jesus Christ." The words of Scripture are, "the *man* Christ Jesus." Another passage he quotes as bearing decisively on this subject. "*Say not in thy heart, Who shall ascend unto heaven? that is, to bring Christ down from above; or, Who shall descend into the deep? that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead.*" Deeper investigation would have convinced him, according to the opinion of the best commentators, that Christ is here, by a common metonymy, put for his doctrine or religion.

Of the facility with which *he* likewise can draw unauthorized inferences from the Scriptures, we have still further proof in this very passage. He goes on to quote. "'*But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart; that is, the word of faith, which we preach; that if thou confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.*' In other words Paul observes, 'Do not concern yourselves how Christ descended from heaven, nor how he again ascended to his glory; believe the fact, that he did descend, and that he again ascended with power sufficient to save as many as shall call upon him.'" Now we affirm, that, in this very passage, St. Paul makes saving faith to comprehend no such article as the descent of Christ from heaven, or from a state of preëxistent glory. The only essential article is his resurrection from the dead, — "*and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.*" Will not this, we ask, comprehend the simplest form of Unitarianism?

This brings us to our last topic, his denunciation of the Unitarians and his reasons for it. It cannot be certainly for the main article of their creed, that from which they derive their name, — their maintenance of the simple unity of God in opposition to a Trinity; for in that opinion he coincides. And, by so doing, he must subject himself to the bitter revil-

ings, which that sect suffers on all sides. Those who maintain the Trinity, he must be aware, consider that between them and all others, there is a great gulf fixed. But our author, though a Unitarian in some sense, is sure that he is on the safe side of the gulf, and that that gulf is not the Trinity, but the Atonement. "If the Scriptures do teach us, and I am clear on this point, that salvation from our sins is only to be attained through the sacrificial death of Christ, and in virtue of that intercession that he makes continually with the Father for us, so I cannot consider the Unitarian doctrine other than an absolute departure from the theory of the Scriptures, and a formal rejection of that salvation, which God has freely offered to us. To reject the mode that God has appointed, leaves no alternative and no hope."

We cannot but be astonished at the rashness with which charges so grave are made, and a doom so dreadful is denounced, upon specifications so exceedingly vague and indefinite. Such is the extreme ambiguity of the language used in this passage, such the number of distinct propositions which it may contain, the denial of either of which may be fraught with unutterable peril, that we must examine them in detail. "Salvation from our sins is only to be attained through the sacrificial death and intercession of Christ" may mean, in the first place, that our past sins could not have been pardoned on repentance, had they not been expiated by Christ; or it may mean, that our deliverance from the dominion and practice of sin can be accomplished only by those divine aids which were purchased by his death; or it may mean simply, that Christ sacrificed his life to persuade men to renounce sin. It may mean that sincere repentance, and all other acts and exercises of a religious man, are inefficacious and unacceptable unless accompanied by this specific element of belief, that the death of Christ was sacrificial and expiatory. Now, in the denial of which of all these possible meanings of this allegation, lies the deadly delinquency of the Unitarians? Suppose it to lie in the last, which on the whole, is more probable, we ask if it be either reasonable or scriptural to suppose, that a sincere penitent Christian man must inevitably be lost, because he does not look on the death of Christ as sacrificial and propitiatory? If the death of Christ be propitiatory and expiatory, it must be so independently of human belief or unbelief. It is a transaction finished and completed ages ago. If it was in-

tended to produce an effect on God to remove any obstacle in him or in his law, that obstacle has been removed. The only fact, in which practical faith can be at all interested, is the fact, that God is now ready to pardon sin on sincere repentance. The practical point is the readiness, not the manner in which it has been brought about. There is no greater inducement to repentance and obedience, on the supposition that Christ died to produce that readiness, than on the supposition that he died to give mankind assurance of it. And, even admitting the sacrificial and expiatory nature of Christ's death to be true, it cannot be proved that even those who fail to recognise it as such, are to be shut out from the benefits of it, unless it can be shown from the Scriptures that God has specified this element of faith in Christ, that his death was sacrificial and propitiatory, as indispensable, superadded to all other requirements. The matter then is reduced to a question of fact, Has he made such a requirement? We affirm that he has not. And instead of running over all the texts of Scripture on this subject, we shall recur to the author's own view of atonement and saving faith, which he has formally summed up, a mode of proceeding which ought certainly to be satisfactory to *him*. "*If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.*" Here is the fundamental and all-comprehending article of Christian faith according to our author, but not one word in it of the sacrificial and expiatory nature of the death of Christ. We do not say too much, then, when we affirm, that he is not only narrowly bigoted, but grossly inconsistent, in condemning Unitarians as lost.

But the ambiguities of this unsparing condemnation are not yet exhausted. A sentence of so grave a nature as inevitable perdition, one would suppose, ought to rest on charges most specific in their statement, and most explicitly made out. "To reject the mode that God has appointed leaves no alternative and no hope." The most natural meaning of *reject*, is to refuse to accept, to refuse to act upon or avail one's self of any thing. Now it does not appear, according to our author's own showing, that the death of Christ, as far as it was sacrificial, has ever been offered to man either for his acceptance or rejection. God, to whom it was addressed, has already accepted it. Man can accept or reject only what is offered

to him. Not the alternative of believing or not believing, that the death of Christ was sacrificial, is offered to man, but of accepting or not accepting the mercy of God thus procured, on condition of true repentance and sincere obedience. And do Unitarians reject the mode which God has appointed in this sense? As far as human judgment is concerned, their lives and characters must answer. If their lives and characters will not suffer by a comparison with the mass of their fellow Christians of other denominations, if their faith in Christ, evinced by their reception of his revelation as the word of God, and worshipping the Father in his name, and, in the midst of persecution and reproach, building temples for the inculcation of his religion, has the power to purify the heart and overcome the world, we know of no sense, except one of the most narrow and irrational bigotry, in which they can be said to reject the mode of salvation which God has offered. Of all men, we should suppose, that our Author ought to beware of wholesale denunciations for mere shades of faith, after such tremendous departures from Orthodoxy as he avows in this book. He must be aware that he

> "but teaches
> Bloody instructions, which, being taught, return
> To plague the inventor."

He must be aware, that, if he establishes the principle that a precisely accurate faith as to the nature of the Atonement be necessary to salvation, the great mass of Christians may mourn over him as quite as liable to damnation, quite as guilty of "rejecting the only mode that God has offered," in failing to recognise the infinite nature of the Victim, as the Unitarians are in failing to perceive that the death of Christ was literally an expiatory sacrifice. Further and more enlarged investigations, we are sure, would convince him that the nature of the Atonement is such, that, among those who believe the fundamental proposition, which he himself has laid down as the corner-stone, the resurrection of Christ, the only fatal heresy is a wicked, irreligious life; that Atonement is a practical, not a speculative subject, reconciliation to God by repentance and reformation, "when by wicked works we were enemies to him;" and that every man receives the benefits of it just so far as he, by a religious life, enjoys peace with God, and the testimony of a good conscience.

His violent prejudices against the Unitarians seem principally to have been excited, not by the general doctrines of the sect, but by some particular passages or statements of some of their champions, such as Priestley, Evanson, and Belsham. He ought to be sure, that the whole denomination participate in those obnoxious sentiments, before he condemns them in a body. Priestley, though one of the greatest men, and one of the sincerest and humblest Christians, who have ever lived, mingled with his religious opinions some philosophical dogmas, which have no more connexion with those opinions than with any other creed, — materialism and philosophical necessity, — dogmas, which, whether true or false, cannot but be chilling and revolting to the great mass of mankind, and would be sufficient, we fear, to sink any religious system, however true, to which they might be attached. He has, besides, on religious topics, advanced some sentiments, and adopted some modes of expression, for which it would be altogether unjust to make all who are denominated Unitarians responsible. The head and front of Evanson's offending consists in having collected and arranged the facts, that altogether annihilate the doctrine of verbal inspiration, which was so long and so obstinately maintained, but which all, who have any tolerable acquaintance with the subject, now perceive it to be necessary to abandon, in order to sustain the divine authority of the Scriptures. And we are sorry to see men, high in place, disingenuous enough, in order to excite horror against the sect among the common people, to criminate the Unitarians, and join in the outcry against them for advocating a theory which they know to be true, and without which they know that inspiration of any kind cannot be sustained for a moment. Mr. Belsham may have been unfortunate in his modes of expression, and extravagant in some of his positions, and may have shocked some even of his own denomination, as well as many out of it; but we believe, that those, who follow in his steps of patient, careful, learned investigation, will always find it more easy to be shocked with his presumption, than to answer his arguments.

One word more on the use of names. It is a standing maxim of the low morality of the world, that "all is fair in politics." Would that we could say that the same principle is not acted upon, though not avowed, in polemical discussion, and in the tactics of sectarian struggle. Here we have a gen-

tleman, who maintains the character of high moral worth, and who would scorn to utter a slander or a base insinuation of any kind; and yet we find him applying the name "Socinian" to a large body of professed disciples of Christ, without even, according to his own confession, having read the works of Socinus, or knowing of course, what his peculiar opinions were, or whether there was any coincidence between them and the opinions of modern Unitarians. But he *did* know, that the Unitarians of the present day disclaim that name, and that the word *Socinian* has been for centuries a nucleus of all evil and hateful associations, which, in the minds of many, may be said instantly to defile and pollute any thing to which it is applied.

To use our author's language, there is nothing with which we are so apt to lose patience, as with the moral obliquity and fraud, which are exhibited in the pulpits of this land every Sabbath day. We see men stand up there as the advocates of justice and righteousness, truth and honesty, and, in the same breath, couple together, in one sweeping anathema, Atheists, Infidels, and Unitarians. Do they not know, that the impression they make upon their uninformed hearers is slanderous and false? Do they not know, that they are doing what in civil affairs would be an indictable offence, and be followed by prosecution, and the loss of moral character and all honorable reputation? Do they not feel the gross injustice, the cruel wrong, which they do their brethren, when, to excite odium against them, they class them with the deniers of a God, and the rejecters of all revelation;— men, who worship God and revere the Saviour, and who labor, according to their own views of truth and duty, to build up his cause? However the Unitarians may fall behind their opponents in professions of piety, we hope that they may never be left to fall so low in point of morality, as to endeavour to throw odium on their adversaries by invidious names and slanderous classifications.

G. W. B.

[For the Christian Examiner.]

ART. IV. — *The "Angel of Jehovah," mentioned in the Old Testament, not identical with the Messiah; being the Conclusion of the Article on the "Deity of the Messiah not a Doctrine of the Old Testament."* *

WE have seen, in the last Number of this journal, that there is no evidence, that the Angel of Jehovah was represented in the Old Testament as a person distinct from Jehovah, and yet the same being with him; and that there is no evidence that any of the Jews at any period ever entertained such a notion. We now come to the second proposition, which is necessary to be established before any one can prove the Deity of the Messiah from the manner in which the Angel of Jehovah is spoken of in the Old Testament, even though the first had been proved to be true. The Deity of the Messiah cannot be proved from those passages unless his identity with the Angel of Jehovah be also established, even though the view of Hengstenberg in regard to the relation of the Angel to Jehovah be right, and ours wrong.

What then is the evidence that the Angel of Jehovah was regarded as identical with the Messiah? In regard to this point, Hengstenberg is supported by some Unitarian writers; by some who regard the angel in question as a created or derived angel; especially by Henry Taylor in his celebrated "Ben Mordecai's Letters."

And here, too, we must remark, in regard to the evidence which might be expected for the second proposition, if it were true, — It is a strange proposition. That the Messiah, whom the prophets set forth as a child, that was to be born, and that was to grow up from small beginnings, that was to be a descendant of David, &c., was the very angel, that appeared to Abraham, Moses, Gideon, &c., is so very extraordinary a proposition, that it is reasonable to require very substantial evidence in its favor, before we can put faith in it. If the prophets had had any knowledge of so remarkable a fact, it must have occupied an important space in their minds. In speaking of the glory of the Messiah, the brightest feature of

* Christian Examiner, Number LXXIV., for May, 1836, p. 240.

their descriptions would have been, that he was the angel, that had appeared so often for the guidance and deliverance of their fathers.

What, then, is the evidence, which Hengstenberg adduces from the prophets, to show that they believed that the expected Messiah would be identical with the Angel of Jehovah. Never, I believe, was so important a proposition attempted to be proved with less evidence. He adduces only four passages, namely, Malachi iii. 1; Hosea iii. 5; Micah v. 1, and Isaiah ix. 5, compared with Judges xiii. 18; and two of these, namely, those in Hosea and Micah, he introduces with a "perhaps," and those two we have explained in a former article.*

In Malachi iii. 1, upon which we made some remarks in our former article, the Messiah is mentioned as מַלְאַךְ הַבְּרִית, which we suppose to be correctly translated in the common version, "the messenger of the covenant," that is, as most critics of every denomination understand it, the messenger of that new covenant, which Jehovah had promised, Jerem. xxxi. 31, "to make with the house of Israel and the house of Judah." We have seen that the term מַלְאָךְ is an official term, used a hundred times to denote a human messenger, and particularly that it was applied to prophets and to priests. But, because the term is also applied to angels, Hengstenberg will have it, that מַלְאַךְ הַבְּרִית, in this verse, should be rendered *Angel of the covenant*, in reference to the old covenant given upon Mount Sinai, although nothing is said by Moses about the law being given by an angel, and although the connexion of the passage evidently points to the future new covenant, rather than to the past, and although the prophets often refer to a Messiah, the descendant of David, as an object of desire and expectation, never to an angel. The idea that the Messiah was the mediator of the old covenant is as inconsistent with the whole tenor of the New Testament,† as of the Old.

The other passage adduced by Hengstenberg to prove the identity of the Messiah with the angel that appeared to the patriarchs, is, if possible, weaker still. Isaiah, in chapter ix. 5, gives to the Messiah the appellation *wonderful*. But in Judges xiii. 18, the angel is represented as saying, "Why

* Christian Examiner, Vol. XIX. pp. 296, 297.

† See John i. 17; v. 46; vii. 19; and the Epistles of Paul, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, *passim*.

askest thou after my name, seeing it is Wonderful;" the original terms being the same, פֶּלֶא, or פֶּלְאִי. Who does not see that the term is not a proper name, and that it may be applied to different persons for different reasons. The term is applied to things as well as persons. Because an angel is called wonderful, it surely does not follow, that every wonderful person is an angel;* much less, the angel mentioned in Judges.

But such reasoning as this is brought to prove the Deity of the Messiah, not only by Hengstenberg, but many others. Indeed no argument is more commonly adduced, in the vicinity of the writer of this article, to prove the Deity of Christ, than one founded on a similar principle. In Isaiah chapter xlv. 21, the Supreme Being is called a Saviour. But, because Jesus Christ is called the Saviour, they will have it, that Jesus Christ must be the Supreme Being, and that Isaiah xlv. affords complete proof of his Deity; forgetting that the same argument will prove Moses, Joshua, Othniel, and a host of others, by whom God saved his people, and who are expressly called Saviours,† to be also the Supreme Being. This argument is insisted on even by President Dwight, in one of his Sermons.

Those two passages, then, together with the two, which he himself regards as doubtful, and which we explained in a former article, are all the evidence which Hengstenberg produces from the Old Testament, to prove the identity of the Messiah that was to be born of a woman at a future day, with the angel that appeared to the patriarchs. What will not one believe, who will believe such a proposition upon such evidence?

Here, too, we might expect the discussion of the second proposition to end. What Hengstenberg undertook was, to prove the Deity of the Messiah from the *Old Testament*. We have examined all the passages he has adduced from it, and shown our readers what they are. It is singular, that he does not confine himself to the Old Testament. To a plain man it will appear very strange, that, if the identity of the angel with the Messiah be a doctrine of the Old Testament, it

* A Jewish comment in Jalcut Simeoni, part 2, fol. 11. 3, (Schoett. I. 924,) is as follows; "The angel said to Manoah, I know not in what shape I am formed; for God changes us every hour. Why then do you ask my name? Sometimes he makes us fire, sometimes wind, sometimes men, and sometimes angels."

† See Nehemiah ix. 27; Judges iii. 9; 2 Kings xiii. 5.

should not be found there clearly revealed. It seems to be a singular procedure to resort even to the New Testament to prove what was revealed to the Jews under the Mosaic dispensation. But, without regard to the applicability of his arguments to the particular proposition which he undertook to prove, let us consider what they are. We will not dwell long upon them, because they have been satisfactorily explained by many writers.

The first is from John i. 11, where it is said of the Logos, "He came to his peculiar possession, and his peculiar people received him not." Without going fully into the explanation of this passage, which has been so often explained by others, it is sufficient to remark, that there is no proof that St. John regarded the Logos as identical with the angel that appeared to the patriarchs, or as identical with the Messiah, though it may have been manifested through him.*

In John xii. 41, says our Author, Isaiah is said to have seen the glory of Christ and to have spoken of him, alluding to Isaiah chapter vi., where Isaiah saw the glory of Jehovah. A person must have a very contemptible opinion of St. John's understanding or memory, who can suppose that he could have regarded the splendid description of Isaiah's inauguration to his prophetic office by Jehovah as a description of the future Messiah. How much more probable is the opinion, that, when he speaks of seeing *his* glory, he means the glory of God, mentioned in verse 38, and that, by "speaking of him," he means, that the declaration, that the hearts of the Jews would be hardened, was applicable to the times of Christ as well as to the times of the prophet Isaiah.† But, whatever may be the explanation of this passage, it certainly has nothing to do with the proposition it is brought to prove, the identity of the Messiah with an angel, who appeared to the fathers.

The next passage adduced by Hengstenberg, is 1 Cor. x. 9. *Μηδὲ ἐκπειράζωμεν τὸν Χριστὸν, καθὼς καί τινες αὐτῶν ἐπείρασαν, καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ὄφεων ἀπώλοντο.* Our common version correctly renders it, "Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted;" that is, evidently, "'tempted' God;" as archbishop Newcome observes, "If we read *Χρίστον*, the sense is, 'Nor

* On the proem of St. John's Gospel, see Norton's "Statement of Reasons," &c. p. 229.

† See Kuinoel upon John xii. 41.

let us tempt, try, prove, provoke, Christ now; as some of them did God at that time.'"

1 Peter i. 11. The Apostle says concerning the prophets, "searching what, or what manner of time, the *spirit of Christ* which was in them did signify." According to a very common use of the genitive, as the genitive of the object, in the New Testament, "the Spirit of Christ" here denotes the spirit relating to the Messiah, the spirit, that suggested what related to the Messiah, or, as it is expressed or rather explained, in the latter part of the verse, "that testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ." No good reason can be assigned, why "the spirit of Christ" is used here, rather than, as elsewhere, "the spirit," "the holy spirit," or "spirit of God," unless the meaning be as we have stated.

In Hebrews xi. 26, Moses is said to have preferred "the reproach of Christ" to "the treasures of Egypt"; that is, as most interpreters of every name understand it, such reproach as Christ endured. So chapter xiii. 13. "Let us, therefore, go forth to him without the camp, *bearing his reproach*," that is, such as he endured. See also Phil. iii. 10. It may even mean, such reproach as Christians endured; such reproach, as was connected with the profession of Christianity.

In Hebrews xii. 26, says Hengstenberg, "the voice of Christ at the giving of the law is said to have shaken the earth."

To us it appears, that the opinion that Christ was concerned in the giving of the Mosaic law is wholly inconsistent with the scope of the author's reasoning in this passage, and throughout the Epistle. His constant aim is to show, that God spoke to mankind by a higher instrumentality and a higher mode in relation to the Christian, than to the Jewish dispensation. In the beginning of the Epistle, chapter i. 1, 2, God is represented as the original speaker in both dispensations. "God who spoke . . . . . to the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken to us by his son." But, objected the Judaizers, God spoke to the chief of the prophets, Moses, *by angels*, on Mount Sinai. To this the author of the Epistle replies, that the son was superior to angels, and that those, who were disobedient to the voice of God speaking by his son in the Christian dispensation, were exposed to far greater punishment than those, who were disobedient to the same voice, uttered by other instrumentality. See chap. ii. 1, 2; x. 28, 29.

In chap. xii. 25, which precedes the verse in question, the writer intends to establish the point, that the Christian religion had higher claims to the regard of men than the Jewish, by representing God as speaking from a *higher scene* in relation to the Christian dispensation, than formerly in relation to the Jewish; that, whereas he had formerly spoken on Mount Sinai, a tangible, gross, material mountain, by angels, he at that time had spoken to them from the spiritual Mount Sion, the heavenly Jerusalem, to which Christians are represented as having come.

We think, then, that throughout the sentence it is God, who is represented as speaking; speaking, agreeably to the language of chap. i. 1, by the Mediator of the new covenant and by the blood of Jesus from the spiritual Mount Sion, as he formerly spoke from Mount Sinai by Moses. "Beware; disregard not him, who speaks; for if they escaped not, who disregarded him speaking upon earth, how much less shall we, who turn away from him speaking from heaven; whose voice then shook," &c.

The figure of God's speaking from heaven is connected with the whole imagery of the passage, which precedes it. Christians are represented as having approached, not a tangible mountain and material objects in this world of sense adapted to produce terror, but to have come to the heavenly Jerusalem.* "But ye have come to mount Sion, and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to myriads of angels, the solemn convocation and assembly of the first-born, whose names are enrolled in heaven, and to God, who rules over all," &c.

The writer to the Hebrews, after representing Christians as

* The heavenly Jerusalem he might have called, in the language of the Platonists, the archetypal and ideal Jerusalem, the city of God in the ideal world. Philo, after saying that the world (the universe) was the house and city of the first man, adds, "But of this city and commonwealth there must have been some citizens before man, who may with propriety be called metropolitans, it being their lot to inhabit the vast encompassing sphere, and they being enrolled as members of the greatest and most perfect polity. But who can these be except intelligent divine natures, some incorporeal and objects of intellect only, and some not without bodies, as is the case with the stars."—*De Mund. Opif.*, Vol. I. p. 34. For this illustration, and for the translation and the substance of the exposition of the passage, we are immediately indebted to a friend, to whom, as a Teacher of the Art of Interpretation and otherwise, we owe more than can be particularly acknowledged.

having come to the Jerusalem in heaven, consistently with this figure represents God as speaking to them from heaven. The literal meaning, which he connected with God's speaking on earth, and from heaven, may have been, that in the Mosaic dispensation he had taught men what in comparison might be called earthly things, while now, speaking from heaven, he had taught men by Christ spiritual and heavenly things.

Knowing the weakness of his Scriptural proofs in regard to the identity of the angel with the Messiah, Hengstenberg again resorts to Jewish tradition. He endeavours to show that certain Jewish writers expected the angel Metatron to come as the Messiah. It follows from what we have proved respecting the Metatron, that to prove it to be a doctrine of Revelation, that he was identical with the Messiah, would be only to establish one form of Unitarianism. But there is no evidence adduced even from the writings of the Cabalists, that the Metatron was expected to come as the Messiah, or to be incarnate. Before, however, we attend to what is brought forward as evidence of such an opinion, let us inquire what weight it should have with us, in case it were established. Suppose, that in the Talmud, or in the writings of the Cabalists, there should be found evidence, that an exalted angel was expected as the Messiah. What is that to us? Are not those writings full of false opinions relating to the Messiah, and to every other subject? Do they not abound with the most fantastical, puerile notions? Is there no way of accounting for the dreams of the Cabalists, except by supposing them to have been revealed by God to the Jews? Let all, which Dr. Allix, Schoettgen, and others have attempted to prove in relation to Jewish tradition, be granted, still, with the writings of the Old Testament in our hands, and their evidence on the subject being what we have shown it to be, we conceive, that, all that can be extracted from the tales of the Talmud, or the mysteries and fooleries of the Cabala, is entitled to absolutely no weight.

And especially is this the case, when it is not pretended by these writers, that the opinion of the Jewish nation, at the time of our Saviour, is expressed by the writings in question. Could it be proved that the whole Jewish nation believed in the Trinity at the time of our Saviour, and that the Messiah was the angel that appeared to the patriarchs, still, with the

Bible in our hands, and with the sure conclusions, to which correct principles of interpretation lead us, we should have no good reason to believe in such a doctrine. We should rather have reason to say, that the Jews taught "for doctrines the commandments of men." Who, in our community, would take the opinions of the majority of the Christian church at the present day, as evidence of what Christ taught on any important subject? No one, who is not ready to make his submission to the Bishop of Rome.

But we have the best evidence, that the great body of the Jewish nation, as far back as history extends, have neither believed in the Trinity, nor in the Deity of the Messiah. The universal opinion among them in modern times is, we presume, well known and acknowledged. "A great and well known difficulty in the conversion of the Jews," says Dr. Jortin, "is the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, which they have always been taught to look upon as not reconcilable with the unity of God."* And, with respect to the Deity of the Messiah, we presume no one will dispute, that the remark of Orobio, a learned Jew, in his controversy with Limborch, expresses the sentiments of the modern Jews. "Admitting," says he, "what is impossible, that the Messiah expected by the Jews should teach the doctrine that he himself is the true God, he ought to be stoned as a false prophet." †

And history tells of no time, when these were not the general sentiments of the Jews. From what is made known of their sentiments in their intercourse with our Saviour, we know that, in general at least, they expected only a triumphant human king. And the earliest writers after the times of our Saviour, on whom much reliance can be placed, give us very explicit testimony on the subject. In his dialogue with Trypho the Jew, Justin represents Trypho as saying, "The doctrine of the incarnation is so extraordinary, that it can never be proved. That this Christ was a God, existing before the ages, is not only extraordinary but ridiculous." "To this," says Justin, "I answered, 'I know that this doctrine appears strange, especially to those of your race.'"

In another passage he says, "Jesus may still be the Christ of God, though I should not be able to prove his preëxistence, as the son of God, who made all things. For, though I should

* Remarks on Eccles. Hist., Vol. III. p. 438.
† Limborch, Amica Collatio, p. 111.

not prove that he had preëxisted, it will be right to say, that in this respect only I have been deceived, and not to deny that he is the Christ, if he appears to be a man born of men, and to have become the Christ by election." To this Trypho replies, "They who think that Jesus was a man, and, being chosen of God, was anointed the Christ, appear to me to advance a more probable opinion than yours. For *all of us* expect, that the Christ will be born a man from man (ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἀνθρώπου), and that Elias will come to anoint him. If he therefore be the Christ, he must by all means be a man born of man." *

Origen testifies, that "the Jews were not acquainted with the incarnation of the only-begotten son of God." In another place he reproaches Celsus for his ignorance in not knowing, "that the Jews never believed that the Messiah would be God, or the son of God."

Such was the belief in regard to the Messiah in the great body of the Jewish nation. And nearly as much as this is admitted by those, who contend that some relics of the Trinity and of the belief in the Deity of the Messiah are yet to be found in some of the Jewish writers. No one has been more famous in that department than Dr. Allix, in a work abounding in incorrect statements and still more in inconclusive reasonings, published in 1699 under the title of "The Judgment of the Jewish Church against the Unitarians." After adducing some of the notions of the Cabalists, which seem to him to look like the Trinity, he says, "All this is still the more remarkable, 1. Because the common Jews have well nigh quite lost the notion of the Messias being God, and they generally expect no other than a mere common man for their Redeemer. 2. Because the main body of the Jews are such zealous asserters of the unity of God, that they repeat every day the words of Deut. vi. 4. 'The Lord our God is one Lord.' It is a practice, which though now they have turned against the Christians, yet doubtless was taken up first in opposition to the Gentiles, whose polytheism was renounced in this short confession of the Jewish faith. And hence it is that they do so much celebrate R. Akiba's faith, who died in torments, with the last syllable of the word *Echad* in his mouth, which signifies the unity of God. 3. Because the Jews at the same time dispute against the Christians' doctrine of the

* Justin. Dial. Opp. p. 233 — 235. Edit. Thirlby.

Trinity; as doth *R. Saadia*, for instance, in his book entitled *Sepher Emunah*, chap. 2. 4. Because from the beginning of Christianity some Rabbins have applied themselves to find out other senses of those passages, which the Christians urge against them. This we see in *Gem. of Sanhedr.* ch. 4, sect. 2." (Allix, p. 176.)

And what is more remarkable still, Allix himself admits, that these writings, which he supposes to teach the Trinity and the Deity of the Messiah, are still popular* amongst the very Jews who reject these opinions. They find nothing in them inconsistent with their present sentiments. None can be found among the Jews, who extract such opinions from these writings, as Dr. Allix, and a few theorists, who tread in his steps.

The opinions of the great body of the Jews being as we have proved them to be by good testimony, and as they are shown to be in all their writings, and as they are admitted to be by Trinitarians, it is of very little consequence what notions may have been entertained by a few mystical Jewish writers. Their opinions can no more help us in the inquiry what are the doctrines of the Old Testament, than some of the most fanciful and mystical writers of the present day will help those, who come a thousand years after us, in regard to the meaning of the New.

These remarks in regard to the Jewish writers are made, not because we believe they are correctly interpreted by those, who appeal to them. We have read the work of Dr. Allix, that of Schoettgen, and what Hengstenberg has written, and we cannot see any shadow of evidence of the belief of a trinity of persons in God, or of the Deity of the Messiah in any of the quotations, which they have adduced. We believe that the quotations in Allix, Schoettgen, and Hengstenberg, weighed and compared, prove the very reverse of what they are brought to prove.

Hengstenberg endeavours to maintain the identity of the angel with the Messiah by only two passages. I. The Sept. version of Isaiah ix. 5. II. One passage from the book Sohar.

In Isaiah ix. 5, it is said of the Messiah, "His name shall be called angel of great counsel, for I will bring peace to the princes, and health or prosperity to him;" καὶ καλεῖται τὸ

* "The Cabalists have passed and do still pass for divines among the Jews, and the Targumists for inspired men." — Allix, p. 177.

ὄνομα αὐτοῦ μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος· ἄξω γὰρ εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας, καὶ ὑγίειαν αὐτῷ. That the Alexandrine translator did not understand the Messiah to be called by the name of the Supreme Being is evident from his rendering אֵל by ἄγγελος instead of θεός. We cannot believe, moreover, that he meant that the child, that was to be born as the Messiah, was to be a preëxistent angel in human form, much less that he was to be any particular, preëminent angel. 1. It is not said, that his name should be called *the* angel, ὁ ἄγγελος, but angel, ἄγγελος. 2. The last clause of the verse seems to indicate the reason for which the translator supposed the name to be given. "For I will bring peace to the princes, and prosperity to him." I suppose the opinion of this translator to have been, that the child that was born would be wonderful in counsel, that is, in wisdom and foresight, exercised for the happiness of his people, so that he would be worthy of the name of angel of great counsel, that is, wisdom.*

One more passage only is adduced by Hengstenberg to show the tradition of the Jews, that the Messiah was identical with the angel, who appeared to the Patriarchs. He passes from the Septuagint Version to the book Sohar, a book written nobody knows when, by nobody knows whom, but certainly later than the Chaldee paraphrasts, or the Talmud, or any of the sources of the ancient Jewish opinions upon which any reliance is placed.† And perhaps nothing could show the weakness of his position in a stronger light, than that, finding nothing to his purpose in the Chaldee paraphrasts, nothing in the Apocrypha, nothing even in the Talmud, he should be able to produce only a single quotation from the Cabalistic book Sohar, which had the appearance of supporting his opinion. On the other hand, we might show, that all the

---

* So in 1 Mac. ii. 65, "I know that Simeon your brother is ἀνὴρ βουλῆς."

† "What of an historical nature," says Eichhorn, "can one learn from that modern spurious book Sohar?" (*Einleitung*, Vol. II. p. 41.) "It is manifestly a forged work," says Dr. Mangey, a Trinitarian, (in his Preface to the Works of Philo, p. xv.,) "manufactured in the seventh century, or perhaps later. It is not the production of Rabbi Simeon, but the forgery of a later Rabbin, greedy of gain. By this and some other Cabalistic books, some have been led to assert, that the doctrine of the Trinity was held by the Jews before Christ. But it is most certain, that they did not hold, nor could they have held, either the thing or the name."

Jewish writers have supported the testimony, which we have adduced, respecting their expectation of a human Messiah. This will not be denied. It is expressly admitted.

The solitary passage brought forward by Hengstenberg to prove that the Messiah was regarded by the ancient Jews as identical with the angel which appeared to the patriarchs, is the following. It is a remark in the book Sohar upon Gen. xxiv. 2, to be found in Schoettgen, Vol. II., page 427, quoted as follows. "Sohar Genes. fol. 77, col. 303, ex versione Sommeri, p. 35. 'Cum dicitur *servus ejus*, intelligitur (secundum interpretationem mysticam,) servus Jehovæ, senior domûs ejus, paratus ad ministerium ejus. Quis vero ille est? *Resp.* Metatron hic est, sicuti diximus, futurus ut conjungatur corpori, (i. e. *corpus humanum assumat*) in utero materno.'" This passage, as it stands here, seems to speak of an incarnation of the angel Metatron, *the servant* of Jehovah. There is nothing, however, in the passage to show that it has any reference to the Messiah, nor how the notion is derived from Gen. xxiv. 2. At any rate, without farther support, it cannot be regarded as an ancient Jewish tradition, but only a notion of the modern Cabalistic book Sohar, which has not been adopted by the Jews, and which possibly they may not find in the passage. How far such a passage contributes to show what was the doctrine of the Old Testament respecting the Deity of the Messiah, let the reader judge.*

---

* After writing the above remarks, we were lucky enough to find the passage repeated in Schoettgen, II. p. 367, with his remarks upon it. He says that the translation of Sommer is inconsistent with the language itself and with the connexion. The words are as follows, "עתיד ליפות לגוף בבתי קברי," which, Schoettgen says, should be rendered "exornaturus sit (futurus ut exornet, a rad. יפה) corpora in sepulcris." In this rendering, so far as the meaning of the words is concerned, he is supported by Buxtorf. Schoettgen also produces the passage, to which "sicuti diximus" refers in the extract from Sohar. Sohar Genes. fol. 77. col. 303. "Traditio est, R. Jochanan dixisse: Metatron, princeps facierum," (that is, prince of the angels, who are called *faces* of God) "qui est puer, servus domini sui, dominantis ipsi, præfectus animæ omni tempore, ut liberet illam ab igne illo constituto. Et ille rationem sumpturus est in sepulcris a Dumah Angelo mortuis præfecto, illumque Domino suo oblaturus est. Idem ille fermentationem ossium intra terram jacentium suscipiet, ut corpora restituat, eaque in integritate suâ, sed sine animâ, constituat. Deus vero S. B. illam in locum suum colloçabit."—Schoett. II., p. 366.

Thus it appears, that the passage has no intimation of the incarnation of the Metatron, but only that, as the angel of life, the opponent of Sammael, he should be concerned in the resurrection of the dead.

As we have mentioned, Hengstenberg has abandoned the position of the identity of the Messiah with the Chaldee *word of Jehovah*. But, as some late writers have defended this opinion, especially Kuinoel, who has manifested great ignorance of the subject in his Introduction to John's Gospel, we will add a few words upon it. That the *word of Jehovah* does not denote a person distinct from Jehovah, we have already shown. That this "word," in whatever sense it was used, was not regarded as identical with the Messiah, is manifest from the following passages from the Targum of Jonathan. "The Messiah and Moses will appear at the end of the age, the one in the desert and the other at Rome, and the word of Jehovah will march between them." "If you shall be dispersed to the end of heaven, the word of Jehovah shall bring you back by the hand of Elias, the high priest, and by the hand of the king Messiah." *

Kuinoel also infers, that some of the Jews expected a superhuman personage as the Messiah, from such passages as the following. Jalcut Simeoni, p. 2, fol. 53, 3, from the book Tanchuma upon Isaiah lii. 3. "The king Messiah is intended. He shall be exalted above Abraham, and lifted up above Moses, and be higher than the ministering angels." But that such passages are wholly inconclusive appears from this, that the same things are said of righteous Jews. Thus Schoettgen remarks, in his note upon Matt. xxii. 30: "The Jews attribute greater glory to men than to angels, not only in this but in the future life." "The Jews ascribe greater excellence to men than to angels, because men, although frail, have overcome evil desires." He supports his remarks by quotations from the same book Tanchuma, in Jalcut Simeoni, fol. 278, 1. "Observe that God loves the Israelites more than the ministering angels. How so? *Ans.* The latter are called מַלְאָכִים, (messengers or angels,) and the Israelites are so called, in Psalm ciii. 20. The angels are called holy; so are the Israelites in Levit. xix. 2. Who then is most loved? *Ans.* He whom God honors with his presence, according to Psalm lxxxii. 1."

So in another passage. "The wisdom of the just, in the times of the Messiah, shall be greater than that of the minis-

* We regret that we cannot now refer to the place where these two quotations are to be found, they having been made some years ago.

tering angels."* Kuinoel also adduces the Targum of Jonathan upon Isaiah xvi. 1, which he renders thus: "Asportent dona Messiæ Israelitarum, qui robustus erit, propterea quod iste in deserto fuit rupes ecclesiæ Sionis." Walton in his Polyglott gives a very different sense to the passage, thus: "Deferent tributa Christo Israel, qui fortis est super eos, qui erant in deserto, ad montem coetûs Sion." The word הַהֵוּ is certainly plural, and, if עַל הַהֵוּ must have the construction which Kuinoel gives it, it must be rendered, "because *they* were in the desert." And, supposing that Christ was called the rock in the desert, the meaning might be, that the Messiah would be strong, because he was *prefigured* by the rock in the desert.

Thus we have found no support in the Old Testament for either of the two propositions, which Hengstenberg undertakes to prove, that "the angel of Jehovah, who appeared to the Patriarchs, was a person distinct from Jehovah and yet Jehovah himself," or "that the Messiah was identical with the angel." We have shown that the passages from the New Testament, which he forces into the service of proving what was revealed in the Old, afford him no aid. And we have shown, that Jewish tradition, instead of supporting, is altogether inconsistent with, the supposition, that a duality of persons in God, and that the Deity of the Messiah, are doctrines of the Old Testament.

G. R. N.

ART. V. — 1. *The Primitive Creed, Examined and Explained; in Two Parts. The First Part containing Sixteen Discourses on the Apostles' Creed. Designed for Popular Use. The Second Part containing a Dissertation on the Testimony of the early Councils and the Fathers, from the Apostolic Age to the end of the fourth Century, with Observations on certain Theological Errors of the Present Day.* By JOHN HENRY HOPKINS, D. D., Bishop of the

* See Schoettgen, II., 163. So Pirke R. Eliezer, in Jalcut Rubeni, fol. 107, 2, in Schoett. I. 514. "Before the Israelites had made the golden calf, they were more beautiful in the sight of God than the ministering angels."

Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Vermont. Burlington. 1834. 12mo. pp. 415.

2. *Christianity Vindicated, in Seven Discourses on the External Evidences of the New Testament, with a Concluding Dissertation.* By John Henry Hopkins, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Vermont. Burlington. 1833. 12mo. pp. 174.
3. *The Primitive Church, compared with the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Present Day; being an Examination of the Ordinary Objections against the Church, in Doctrine, Worship, and Government. Designed for Popular Use. With a Dissertation on Sundry Points of Theology and Practice, connected with the Subject of Episcopacy.* By John Henry Hopkins, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Vermont. Burlington. 1835. 12mo. pp. 380.

By the Primitive Creed, Bishop Hopkins does not mean the creed of Peter, the oldest Christian creed of which we have any account; "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."* This was the only article of faith originally deemed necessary to constitute a person externally a Christian. It presupposed, of course, a belief in one God, the Father. But the Jews had already been initiated into this belief. "Ye believe in God," said Jesus; he adds, "believe also in me,"† as the "Christ," the "anointed," the commissioned of him; the only additional truth the belief of which he required as distinctive of the Christian profession. We find the two articles again conjoined in his last solemn prayer; "This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent," that is, Jesus Christ as sent of thee.‡ And thus we find, that Jews and others already acknowledging the existence of the only true God, were, by the Apostles, admitted to baptism, upon simply professing, in addition, their belief of the latter article.

We here see the origin of creeds. They were baptismal confessions, baptism being regarded as an initiatory rite by which a person was introduced into the community of believ-

* Matt. xvi. 16. John vi. 69. † John xiv. 1.

‡ John xvii. 3. St. Paul's creed corresponded. "There is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." 1 Tim. ii. 5.

ers, numbered among Christians. These confessions were the *symbol*,* sign, token, or mark of Christian faith, as the ceremony of baptism was of Christian consecration. They embraced originally as we have said, in addition to the belief in the existence of one God over all, the Father, always tacitly implied, if not expressed, one simple truth, that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God, which was the *primitive* Christian creed, as a belief in the one only true God constituted the primitive Jewish creed. Other articles were added from time to time, according to the discretion of individuals, or communities of believers.

The most fruitful source of additions was the numerous heresies which, in process of time, sprang up in the church, in opposition to which new clauses were successively introduced into the creeds, or symbols. They were thus perpetually growing in bulk, and, in the same proportion, becoming more dark and metaphysical, abounding more and more in absurd or unintelligible distinctions and refinements, till every feature of their original simplicity was obliterated.

By the "primitive creed," Bishop Hopkins means that usually termed the "Apostles' Creed," and he more than insinuates that it really had an apostolic origin. Such is the impression he evidently means to leave on the minds of his readers. "Many," says he, "believe, not without reason, that this is the precise form or summary of the faith which was left to the church of Rome, by the Apostles Peter and Paul." † Again; "What consideration can endear this venerable relic of early faith, more than the fact, that the disciples of the blessed Apostles, the holy martyrs and confessors, the workers of miracles, and the eminent saints, who adorned the first ages of Christianity, made it a part of their solemn worship to *recite these very words*." ‡

---

* "Perhaps," says Neander, "this word at first denoted only the 'formula' of baptism, and was afterwards transferred to the confession of faith." — *History of the Christian Religion and Church*, Vol. I. p. 352, note. Ed. Lond. 1831.

† Page 1.

‡ Page 2. The Bishop is mistaken as to the use made of creeds by Christians of the early ages. The recital of them did not form "part of their solemn worship," strictly speaking; they were not introduced, in fact, into the ordinary services of public worship; they were used only at baptism. The person to be baptized was examined as to his belief of certain Scriptural truths, or summaries of truth, to each article of which

We have read these and similar statements with unfeigned astonishment. We would willingly impute them to inattention or ignorance, or to the author's loose way of thinking and writing, which seems to be habitual with him. But we fear that we must ascribe them to a less creditable origin. We must confess they have too much the appearance of design; and, as we are constrained to admit that the Bishop in other parts of the volumes before us, is not above resorting to artifice and trick, for the sake of impression, we can the more readily believe that he has, in the present case, allowed himself to speak rather for effect on ignorant minds, than with a scrupulous regard to exactness. We do not, it is true, rate his learning very high. Whoever looks into his publications with the expectation of finding in them evidence of ripe scholarship, nice critical acumen, theological research, or even a tolerable acquaintance with Christian antiquity, and the literary history and value of the several writings attributed to it, will find himself grievously disappointed. But, scanty as are his stores of antiquarian and critical learning, he must certainly know better than to set down the Apostles as the real authors of the creed which passes under their name. It is rather too late in the day to attempt to revive the credit of this stale fiction.

That the creed in question was not the production of the Apostles, is a point which has been long universally conceded by the learned, both Protestant and Catholic, and to go into a discussion of it would be a mere waste of time and labor. For the benefit of Bishop Hopkins, however, we will give two or three quotations and references, after which we will state a few facts relating to the history of the document.

The Bishop says that the creed is "*not without reason*" believed to be the "*precise form or summary*" left by the Apostles Peter and Paul; that "*these very words*" were recited, as "part of their solemn worship," by the immediate disciples of the Apostles, the "workers of miracles, and the eminent saints" of primitive days. But hear what Mosheim, an author whose statements are entitled to some little respect, says in reference to the opinion which assigns the composition of it to the Apostles. "*All who have any knowledge of anti-*

he was required separately to give his assent, these summaries, for some centuries, varying according to the judgment and will of those who administered the rite.

quity, confess unanimously, that this opinion is a mistake, and has no foundation."* Dr. Isaac Barrow, an old English divine of some eminence, of whom Bishop Hopkins may possibly have heard, speaks of the "original composition and use" of the creed as "not known," and argues that "in ancient times there was no one form generally fixed and agreed upon," that the "most ancient and learned" of the Fathers, were either "wholly ignorant that such a form, pretending the Apostles for its authors, was extant, or did not accord to its pretence, or did not at all rely on the authenticalness thereof."† Dr. Barrow wrote more than a century and a half ago. The well-known Du Pin, too, a little later, resolutely combated the notion that the creed was written by the Apostles; pronounces it "very improbable"; says that it is evident that the Apostles "did not draw up any one form of faith comprehended in a set number of words;" that there is "no rashness here in departing from the vulgar opinion;" that the advocates for its Apostolic origin, are obliged to yield, when urged, and acknowledge that "our creed is not the Apostles' as to the words."‡ "That it is rash to attribute it to the Apostles," says Buddeus, "is not only proved by the clearest reasons, but the more prudent and candid among the Romanists themselves confess it."§ "All learned persons," says Sir Peter King, "are now agreed, that it never was composed by the Apostles."‖ "It is not known by whom, or at what precise time," observes Bishop Tomline, "this creed was written." "The Apostles did not prescribe any creed."¶ "No one," says Neander, "imagined that the Apostles had composed this confession in so many words." It was supposed to contain the doctrine which had "descended from the tradition of the Apostles," which "they preached both *vivâ voce* and by their writings," hence called the "Apostolic preaching," or "Apostolic tradition;" and "the misunderstanding of this name afterwards produced the fiction, that the Apostles themselves had literally composed this confession."**

---

* Institutes of Eccles. Hist., Vol. I. p. 96, Murdock's Translation.

† Exposition of the Creed. Works, Vol. I. p. 357. fol. Lond. 1716.

‡ New Hist. Eccles. Writers, Vol. I. p. 9. Lond. 1693.

§ Ecclesia Apostolica, p. 191. Jen. 1729.

‖ Primitive Church. Part II. p. 57. Lond. 1719.

¶ Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles. Art. VIII. See Elements of Christian Theology, Vol. II. pp. 224—226. Ed. Lond. 1804.

** Neander, History of the Christian Religion and Church, Vol. I. p. 351.

We might adduce numerous other testimonies, but the above are sufficient and more than sufficient to show what all the world, with the exception of the Bishop of Vermont, knew before, that the question of the Apostolic origin of the creed has been long satisfactorily settled. The tradition which ascribes to it such an origin cannot be traced in any writings now extant, or of which we have any account, of a date earlier than the end of the fourth century. We first meet with it in Rufinus, bishop of Aquileia, who wrote late in the fourth and early in the fifth century.* The Apostles, says he, according to the tradition of the Fathers, being about to disperse to carry the Gospel into different parts, assembled to determine the rule of their future preaching, and being full of the Holy Spirit, each one of them contributed what was agreeable to his own views, thus forming a creed, which was to guide them in their teachings, and to be delivered as a rule to believers.† The writer of a piece falsely attributed to Augustine, proceeds so far as to point out the particular article contributed by each Apostle.

Had this tradition been founded in truth, it is difficult to account for the fact that the creed was not, like the other known productions of the Apostles, admitted into the number of canonical writings; that Luke, in relating the acts of the Apostles, has observed a total silence on the subject; and, still further, that no allusion to any such document, as a production of the Apostles, occurs in any of the learned Fathers of greater antiquity than Rufinus, as Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Minutius Felix, Origen, Cyprian, Lactantius, the historian Eusebius, Athanasius, and many others, though in their disputes with heretics, occasions innumerable occurred, on which they could have alleged nothing more appropriate and decisive than several clauses of the creed, had it existed as a known or reputed relic of the Apostles. During the same period, numerous councils were assembled, some of which formed creeds, which were regarded as authoritative, and were used in the rite of baptism, an act then deemed of the greatest

* We make no account of a piece attributed to Ambrose of Milan, containing an allusion to the tradition, since the document is admitted by universal consent to be spurious. Were it genuine, its testimony would add little weight to the tradition, being cotemporary, or nearly so, with that of Rufinus. Ambrose died A. D. 398; Rufinus survived him but twelve years.

† Expositio Symboli.

solemnity; yet in none of the canons of those councils, and in none of their creeds, is there the slightest allusion to any existing creed claiming an Apostolic sanction. It is farther observable, that whenever the Ante-Nicene Fathers attempt, as they frequently do, to give a sort of abstract of Christian doctrine, they allow themselves no small latitude both of sentiment and expression, always differing from each other, and from themselves at different times; a circumstance which can be explained only on the supposition, that there was no authoritative symbol to which they could appeal, but that each individual or body and division of believers were left to express their own views of Christian truth in their own way. The Roman creed, in the form in which we first meet with it, differed from the old Oriental, in existence, it would seem, before the Nicene or Constantinopolitan, and both, as we shall presently see, from that of Aquileia. It differed, too, from the Jerusalem creed, expounded by Cyril about A. D. 340; and yet, had the Apostles, before their separation, as the tradition given by Rufinus states, composed a creed to be the rule of their future preaching, and a standard of faith to all believers, the fact must have been known to the Christians of Jerusalem, and we can hardly suppose that the Church in that place, the mother of all the rest, would have suffered so valuable a legacy to be lost, and the very memory of it to have perished.

Rufinus, in his account of the origin of the creed, was followed by Jerome and the Latin Fathers generally, and the tradition was currently believed till the time of the Reformation. Erasmus was one of the first in modern times to call it in question, and subsequent inquiries, as we have said, have led to its utter rejection, except by the "Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Vermont."

Even he, notwithstanding his confident assertions, seems at times to have had some misgivings; for in a Dissertation, as he strangely enough terms it, annexed to his Discourses on the Creed, after observing that he does "not intend to discuss the question whether the particular form of words, known throughout so many centuries as the Apostles' Creed, was delivered in its present shape by the Apostles themselves," which, in the Discourses, he affirms there was "good reason" for believing, he proceeds to say, "Such *was* undoubtedly the

prevailing opinion of the Christian church in all ages." * But even this assertion is a great deal broader than facts warrant. It *was* the prevailing opinion from the beginning of the fifth century, not before, till the time of the Reformation, or a little later. From the moment the human mind awoke from the slumber of the dark ages, it began to lose ground, and, like a multitude of other absurdities, which had before obtained currency, was at length exploded.

It is more difficult to trace the origin and gradual completion of the Apostles' Creed than to refute the hypothesis which ascribes it to an act of the Apostles. In its primitive and simpler form, it may probably have been the baptismal creed of the Roman Christians. As the Roman Church rose to celebrity, its creed, of course, would grow in dignity and importance along with it; and when finally it came to be denominated, by way of eminence, the "Apostolical" church, founded, according to tradition, by the very chief of the Apostles, and by Paul, it is not surprising that its symbol also should have claimed for itself the distinction of an Apostolic origin.

There are several other creeds, or summaries of faith, however, of which an earlier record remains than of this. The first which occurs is that of Irenæus, bishop of Lyons in Gaul, who flourished near the end of the second century. "The Church," he says, "dispersed throughout the whole world, to the remotest confines of the earth, holds the faith which it received from the Apostles and their disciples, which is in one God, the Father, Almighty, who made heaven, and earth, and the sea and all that is therein; and in one Jesus Christ, the Son of God, incarnate for our salvation; and in the Holy Spirit which, by the prophets, preached the economy, and the advent, and birth from the virgin, and passion, and resurrection from the dead, and assumption, in the flesh, into heaven, of our beloved Lord Jesus Christ, and his coming from heaven, in the glory of the Father, to consummate all things, and to raise up all flesh of the whole human race, that to Christ Jesus, our Lord and God, and Saviour and King, according to the good pleasure of the invisible Father, every knee may bow of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue may confess to him, and that he may execute just judgment on all, casting

* Page 257.

into eternal fire spiritual wickedness, and angels that are transgressors, being apostate, and impious men and unjust, and flagitious and blasphemous, but to the just and holy who have observed his precepts, and persevered in his love from the first, or after repentance, granting eternal life, and conferring on them incorruption and eternal glory." *

Another shorter summary occurs in the same author, of a character similar to the preceding.†

Tertullian, bishop of Carthage, who flourished about the year 200, a little after the time of Irenæus, gives us three creeds, or abstracts of Christian doctrine, the shortest of which is as follows. "There is only one rule of faith, which is not to be changed nor reformed; to believe in one God, Almighty, maker of the world, and his Son, Jesus Christ, born of the Virgin Mary, crucified under Pontius Pilate, the third day raised from the dead, received into heaven, now sitting at the right hand of the Father, and who shall come to judge the quick and dead, through the resurrection of the flesh." ‡ This presents a very near resemblance in language to parts of the Apostles' Creed, but wants, as will be readily perceived, several articles found in the latter, and, what is remarkable, it contains no reference whatever to the Holy Spirit. In the other two, which are much longer, the similarity is far less striking, and they are somewhat tinctured with the subtilties of the Alexandrian Platonists, which pervaded all the theological writings of the age.

---

* Adv. Hær. L. I. c. 10. Bishop Hopkins (p. 258) professes to give a translation of this creed, and places the Greek at the foot of the page. In his version, for "Apostles and *their* disciples," as in the original, he gives "Apostles and *other* disciples." This may be an inadvertency. Another, and more important variation from the original we observe, whether caused by accident or design we are unable to say. The clause translated literally is as follows: "and in the Holy Spirit, which by the prophets preached the economy and the advent, and birth from the virgin, and passion, and resurrection from the dead, and assumption in the flesh into heaven, of our beloved Lord Jesus Christ." After the word *advent*, the Bishop, without any authority whatever from the original, has thrust in "of God"! We can conceive of no adequate motive for this. The sentence does not require the addition to render the sense complete. The meaning is clear without it, and is only embarrassed by the interpolation.

† L. III. c. 4.

‡ De Velandis Virginibus, c. 1. The other two are found, Adv. Prax. c. 2, and De Præscript. Hæreticorum, c. 13. Ed. Par. 1646.

Two passages occur in the writings of Origen containing a creed or general summary of Christian truth, as he understood it, and as it was to be gathered, as he says, from the Scriptures; one very brief,* and the other longer, and embracing nearly the same topics introduced into that of Irenæus given above, but treated in a more diffuse way, and presenting a broader line of distinction between the Father and the Son.†

Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, about the middle of the third century, comes next, who tells us that persons, on being baptized, were required to express their belief "in God, the Father, his Son, Christ, the Holy Spirit, the remission of sins, and eternal life through the holy church." ‡

We have another by Gregory Thaumaturgus, of Neocæsarea, a disciple of Origen, somewhat longer, and more dark and metaphysical, and as unlike as possible to the Apostles' Creed.

Nothing else in the shape of a creed occurs, in any genuine writing of the first three centuries.§ The Nicene soon followed, which was somewhat augmented by the council of Constantinople, A. D. 381; and the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, the former A. D. 431, and the latter A. D. 451, forbade the making, or the use of any other, taking no notice of the Apostles' Creed, and thus virtually excluding it.‖ It was not customary to recite the creed at every administration of divine service, in the Eastern church, before the beginning of the sixth century, and in the Western till near the end of the same; and the creed thus recited was the Nicene or Constantinopolitan just referred to, and not the Apostles'.

Rufinus, to whom, as we have said, we are indebted for the tradition of the Apostolic origin of the creed, has preserved a copy of it, as it existed in his time, the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century, under three different forms as used in different churches; or rather he has given us three

---

* Comment. in Johan., T. 32. † Proem to Book of Principles.

‡ Epist. 76.

§ Bishop Hopkins quotes from a confession of faith contained in a Letter ascribed to the first council of Antioch, and addressed to Paul of Samosata, apparently without being aware that the document is spurious.

‖ The fact is adverted to by Charles Butler, in the following words: "When the council of Ephesus, and afterwards the council of Chalcedon, proscribed all creeds except the Nicene, neither of them excepted the symbol of the Apostles from the general proscription." — *Historical and Literary Account of Confessions.*

creeds, the Roman, the Oriental, and that of Aquileia. That the Roman, in its more brief form, existed before his time, is not to be doubted, for its simplicity bears decided marks of antiquity; but of its history previous to this period nothing certain is known. Sir Peter King, in his excellent work,* has attempted to analyze it, and distinguish the articles of which it was originally composed from the clauses afterwards introduced in opposition to the several heresies which successively sprang up in the church; but, from the paucity of facts history has preserved, he is often compelled to resort to arguments which are purely conjectural.

It appears from Rufinus, that the first article of the Roman creed, as it stood in his time, and of that of Aquileia, wanted the clause "maker of heaven and earth"; and that the Oriental creed had, instead of it, "invisible and impassible," added, according to Rufinus, in opposition to the Sabellian heresy. The Roman, too, omitted the epithet *one* before "God," and stood simply "I believe in God, the Father Almighty." The second article differs little, in the three creeds, except in the collocation of the words, which varies considerably, and, instead of "Jesus Christ," the Oriental creed reads *one* Jesus Christ, in common with the Nicene and the older Greek creeds generally. The present creed retains the article, as it stood in the Roman. The third article is the same in the three, the present creed differing verbally from all. In the fourth article, the words "suffered" and "dead," found in the present creed, are wanting in the three ancient, and the phrase "descended into hell," is found only in that of Aquileia, being wanting in both the Roman and Oriental. The fifth is the same in all four, as also the sixth, excepting that the epithet "Almighty" is wanting in that of Aquileia and the Roman. The seventh is the same precisely in all. In the eighth, the present creed repeats "I believe," which is not found in this place in either of the three mentioned by Rufinus. In the ninth article, the present creed differs in three particulars from that of Aquileia, the Roman, and Oriental. In the three latter, the word "*Catholic*" is wanting, as also the phrase "communion of saints," at the end; and the words "I believe," which are wanting in the preceding article, are inserted at the commencement of this.

* History of the Apostles' Creed, with Critical Observations on its several Articles.

In the three old creeds, the article was simply, "I believe the holy church." The tenth article is the same in all; the eleventh also, with a single exception, that of Aquileia having "*this* body," instead of "*the* body," as in the rest. With this clause the three old creeds end, the twelfth article, or "And the life everlasting," found in the present creed, being wanting in all. *

Some of these variations are in themselves unimportant. It will be perceived, however, from our comparison, that since the end of the fourth century, the Roman, or Apostles' creed, has received four considerable additions; the clause "descended into hell," in the fourth article, the epithet "Catholic" and the clause "communion of saints," in the ninth, and the whole of the last.

The clause "descended into hell" first appears, it would seem, in the Arian creed of Ariminum, A. D. 359. It is also found in a creed recorded by Epiphanius, who flourished in the latter part of the fourth century, and also in that of Cyril of Jerusalem. At what time it was admitted into the Roman and Oriental creeds, we have no means of ascertaining. It was adopted, as Sir Peter King thinks, as an antidote to the heresy of Apollinarius, who denied the reality of Christ's human soul.

The term "catholic" first appears in the creed of Alexander of Alexandria, about the period of the rise of the Arian controversy. It is found also in Epiphanius, from whom it passed to the Latins. At what time it found its way into the Roman creed is uncertain. The clause "communion of saints" was added, as is supposed, in reference to the schism of the Donatists, probably during the fifth century. It is not known on what occasion, or when, the last clause, relating to the "life everlasting," was added. The creed first appears in its present form in the time of Gregory the Great, who died A. D. 604.

With the history of the document we have now done. We leave the Bishop to explain the facts we have stated, consistently with his cherished persuasion, that the creed he reads from the Prayer Book contains the "precise form" left by the Apostles, and recited by their disciples, the "holy martyrs,"

* Rufin. Expositio Symboli. See also, Du Pin, T. I. p. 12, and G. J. Vossius de Tribus Symbolis. Dissert. I. § 31 — 43.

and "workers of miracles." We proceed to give some further account of the contents of his book.

The title of the volume, is the "Primitive Creed *Examined* and *Explained*." Any other title would have been equally appropriate. He enters into no *examination* of the creed, either historically or critically. The first article in the table of contents to the volume is, the "Origin of the Creed." But he engages in no discussion in regard to its origin. He asserts, as we have said, that it is believed with reason to have been made by the Apostles, in the precise form in which we now have it, and there he leaves the matter.

The volume is divided into two parts, the first of which is composed of sixteen discourses on the creed, designed, as he says, for "popular use." But they contain no *explanation* whatever of the creed, in any correct sense of the term. If the *animus componendi*, the views of the author, be essential to a true exposition, he cannot be said even to have approached the subject. He is at no pains to ascertain how the several articles were understood by the original framers of the creed. The discourses consist of a series of doctrinal harangues, on the Trinity, and kindred topics, written not in the best possible taste, having only the semblance of argument, and setting at defiance every correct principle of biblical criticism and interpretation.

It is not our intention to follow the author through his strange medley of unsupported assertions, and futile and absurd inferences. His book is not worth a serious reply. The proofs he adduces are of the stalest kind, and all of them that are deserving of notice have been already fifty times refuted. We cannot suffer the occasion to pass, however, without furnishing our readers with a specimen of the sort of reasoning which a dignitary of the American Episcopal church can condescend to use, in support of the "trinitarian faith," the denial of which he regards as a most "perilous" thing.

In this view, the book is indeed a curiosity, a marvel. We read it with much the same sort of feeling with which we should read a set of monkish expositions of the days of Rabanus Maurus, or Remigius of Auxerre,* with the exception only of

* Two, among a host of worthless expositors, of the ninth century, who professed to derive their materials from the Fathers, and delighted in seeking far-fetched and recondite meanings. Rabanus, in particular,

our surprise on discovering, from the title-page and several modern allusions contained in the volume, that we are perusing a production not of the ninth, but of the nineteenth century.

Before we offer the specimens alluded to, however, we must take notice of an opinion the Bishop has thought fit to express in regard to the merits of the Fathers, as expositors of Scripture. We are induced to do this, in the present connexion, from the circumstance that the Bishop's own achievements in the exegetical art, furnish, in our view, no unapt commentary on the opinion, being the most precious morsel of absurdity we have met with for many a day. The opinion to which, to do him justice, he adheres throughout with consistent pertinacity, is thus expressed in his preface: "Next to the Scriptures, and as the *best school for sound scriptural interpretation*, he (the Bishop) holds the writers of the first ages in the highest esteem." *

In reading this very extraordinary statement we were at first at a loss to determine whom the writer intended to designate as writers of the "first ages." We could not suppose that he had reference simply to the Apostolical Fathers, as they are called. For, besides that no genuine and undisputed remains of these Fathers are now extant, the writings circulated under their name, whatever evidences of piety they may afford, are not such, we should think, that even Dr. Hopkins would be fond of appealing to them as containing specimens of critical judgment or "sound scriptural interpretation." On examination, we find that by "primitive" writers, he means to designate the Fathers of the first four centuries. He expressly calls Irenæus a "primitive witness"; and at the commencement of the first chapter of his dissertation, which composes the second part of the volume, and in which he professes to adduce the "testimony" in favor of the Trinity found in the writers of the first four centuries, he calls this, "the testimony of the primitive church," which, "next to the Scriptures," he sees not "how any reflecting person can avoid holding in the highest esteem." † He speaks of the "declarations of faith which occur in the earlier writers and councils," in reference to the same period. And again, at the close of the chapter,

---

was much celebrated in his day, and his works are comprised in six folio volumes.

* p. viii. † p. 257.

after observing that he has "traced the trinitarian faith from the creed of Irenæus" down to the "latter part of the fourth century," he terms the evidence thus adduced that of the "primitive church." * We should use the expression in a much more restricted sense. Of the propriety or impropriety of the more extended sense in which the Bishop employs it, however, we have no disposition to enter into controversy with him. Our only object has been to ascertain what Fathers he includes in the number of writers of the "first" or "earlier" ages, whom he pronounces the very best interpreters of the Scriptures.

We confess we were not a little surprised to hear the claim of a sound interpretation of the Scriptures thus broadly asserted, in favor of the old Fathers, from Irenæus down to John Chrysostom. For, sincerely as we venerate their piety, and the many noble traits of character they exhibited, worthy of all admiration; sensible as we are of the value of their writings as repositories of facts we could derive from no other source; and highly as we esteem their labors and sacrifices, by means of which Christianity triumphed over the polluted and debasing superstitions of Paganism, we had supposed that the time had gone by, when their expositions of Christian truth and the Christian records would be appealed to as entitled to any extraordinary respect.

Many of them were learned; but few of them knew how to apply their learning to any good purpose. With the exception of Origen and Jerome, they were not versed in the original language of the Old Testament, but relied on the faulty Version of the Seventy, to which they attributed a sort of inspiration. Of the Arabic, the Syriac, and other languages, having an affinity, greater or less, with the Hebrew, or useful in unlocking sources of information tending to throw light on Jewish records and opinions, they were ignorant. The theology of most of them exhibited a strange and unnatural union of Christian doctrines with the philosophy taught in the Platonic schools of Alexandria, the most worthless that ever disgraced the human intellect; and they were, almost without exception, addicted to the fanciful modes of interpretation, and particularly the allegorizing spirit, which characterized the same schools. There is no species of absurdity, in interpretation,

* pp. 313, 314.

reasoning, faith, or opinion, of which their writings do not furnish abundant examples. But we are not about to discuss the merits of the Fathers. We consider the question touching their claims to respect, so far as the point under consideration is concerned, as already fully settled in the several learned treatises which have at different times appeared on the subject, by which, however, the Bishop, if he has condescended to read them, gives evidence of having profited little. We will give a few specimens of their exegetical and doctrinal skill and accuracy, and then proceed to show, by some examples, with what fidelity he has trodden in their steps.

Justin, the earliest of them, found a hidden meaning in almost every sentence and word of the Old Testament, and could prove any doctrine from any passage. He was a believer in the Jewish dream of the millennium, or fleshly reign of Christ and his saints for a thousand years on earth, which he thought had the support of Scripture, and in proof of which he appealed to the text; "The day of the Lord is a thousand years," and again, "As the days of a tree shall be the days of my people"!

Irenæus and others detected the Trinity, such as it was in their day, in texts which, to ordinary mortals, would seem as applicable to any thing else as to that. The just named Father found an illustration and confirmation of it in the two spies who came to Rahab.* The two, the good Father, either from lapse of memory, or because it better suited his purpose, changes into three, and he proceeds gravely to remark, that "Rahab, the harlot, received the three spies, who came to explore the land, and hid them with her, namely, the Father, and the Son, with the Holy Spirit."† This same Rahab makes a conspicuous figure in the theology and commentaries of the Fathers. Several of them, as Ambrose, Augustine, and others, make her a type of the Gentile church, and the scarlet cord by which the spies were let down through the window by the wall, was emblematic of the blood of Christ, by which we obtain salvation.

Jesse, sending David to seek his brethren,‡ according to Augustine, is a type of God, the Father, who sent his Son, of whom it is written, "I will declare thy name to my *brethren*." By the three measures of parched corn, which it seems he

* Josh. ii. † L. IV. C. 20. Ed. Par. 1710. ‡ 1 Sam. xvii.

took with him, the shrewd Father observes, is to be understood the Trinity!

They found the Trinity, too, in the act of Elijah, stretching himself three times on the dead child; and again in the text, "A threefold cord is not quickly broken." "Trinitas non rumpitur." They allegorized the story of David and Bathsheba. David, it was said, represented Christ, — Bathsheba, the church, his spouse, — and Uriah, the Devil! They found types of Christ, or of his cross, everywhere; in Judah, "washing his garments in wine;" in David, slaying the lion and the bear, Christ doing the same when he descended into *hades* to rescue imprisoned spirits; in Balaam's ass,* though according to Origen the latter represented the church, which formerly bore evil powers, but now Christ. The tree of life in Paradise, prefigured the cross; and so did Moses' rod, Jacob's staff, and the oak of Mamre, and the "seventy willows" found by the Israelites after crossing the Jordan; all either typified the cross, or had some other symbolic property equally precious. In fact there is too much ground for the sarcastic remark once made, that there is scarcely a piece of wood or dry stick mentioned in the Old Testament, which has not, by the fertile imagination of one or another of these Fathers, been raised to the dignity of prefiguring the cross.†

---

* Irenæus.

† If, in speaking of the Fathers as the best interpreters of Scripture, the Bishop refers not to their expositions of its language, strictly so called, but to their teachings as furnishing a sort of guide to its interpretation, from the presumption that those, who lived near the times of the Saviour and the Apostles, would be more likely than others, of a remote age, to retain the construction originally put on their words, as of this construction there would be a sort of current tradition, the case is not much altered. The language of the Saviour, we know, was in many respects entirely misapprehended by the early Christians, and their successors for several ages. Of this we have evidence in the construction which was put on his discourse relating to the destruction of Jerusalem, from which the first disciples derived the impression, that the world was speedily to be dissolved, and Christ visibly to descend to judgment. Time soon corrected or modified this error. Still, among the Fathers of the first four centuries, there was a very prevalent expectation, founded partly on some expressions used by Paul, and partly on Jewish tradition, that the millennial reign of Christ, the end of the world, the day of final judgment and renovation of all things, was near. The misapprehensions of the early Christians on these and other points we might mention, show that their conceptions of the purport of our

Many of Bishop Hopkins's arguments for the Trinity strongly remind us of those of the Fathers above referred to. They are worth just about as much; and his ingenuity in extracting types and resemblances, entitles him, we think, to rank among the worthy pupils of Justin Martyr or Origen. Thus he makes the sacrifice of Isaac the type of our Saviour's resurrection. The whole transaction, he tells us, was "typical and figurative, shadowing forth, by the most affecting emblem, the love of God the Father, who spared not his own Son, — the love of the Son of God, who submitted to such sufferings for our sakes, — and the resurrection of our great Redeemer from the grave, even as Isaac was raised from the pile, on which he had been bound for a burnt-offering." * Not only was the fact of the resurrection "announced beforehand" by type, but the time of it, says the Doctor, was prefigured, by type also. This type he finds not simply in the history of Jonah. He has discovered another, with which he seems to be marvellously pleased, in the "sheaf" which, by command of Moses, the priest was required to wave before the Lord on the day after the (Jewish) Sabbath, the very day, the Bishop does not fail to observe, on which our Saviour rose. "Thus," says he, "we have another type, in which the very day of the resurrection is presignified, and the whole of which shadows forth, most interestingly, the doctrine of the text." † The ascension of Christ was typified by the high priest entering once a year into the holy of holies, — the tabernacle, according to the Bishop, representing the world, — the holy of holies, the heavens, into which the high priest alone could enter, and he but once a year, after "a solemn atonement offering." "Now all this," says the Bishop, "was typical of Christ." ‡ The exaltation of Christ was prefigured by Joseph, who, after he was delivered from prison, was made a ruler by Pharaoh, "a clear representation of the exaltation of Christ, who came from prison and judgment, and the dungeon of the grave, and was raised by God, the Father, to the rule and government of the Universe." § Of course, he finds numerous types of the atone-

---

Saviour's teachings, whencesoever derived, are entitled to very little respect.

* p. 91.

† p. 99. The text referred to is Rom. iv. 25: "Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification."

‡ p. 105. § p. 106, 7.

ment; the "sacrifice of Isaac by his father Abraham," the paschal lamb; — but, adds the Bishop, suddenly checking himself in the act of enumeration, "the time would fail us, if we were to notice the tenth part of those types of the death and the atonement of our blessed Sacrifice, which the Mosaic institutions contain in their ceremonial law." *

We will now state a few of the Bishop's proofs and illustrations of the Trinity. A numerous class of these proofs he finds in the application of common titles, names, and epithets, to the Father and the Son. His argument drawn from this source goes on the principle, that, whenever the same term or expression, though used in a different sense, is applied to two individuals, those individuals must necessarily be one. This principle, thus announced in plain terms, appears so perfectly absurd, that our readers may be inclined to doubt whether any man of common understanding can possibly adopt it as the foundation of his reasonings. And yet many of the Bishop's Scriptural proofs, if carefully examined, will be found to be worth nothing, except on the assumption of the correctness of this principle.

Thus, because God is called a "Saviour" and Christ a "Saviour," he infers that "both must possess the same divine nature." But so are a multitude of others said in the Scriptures to save, or are called "saviours." Othniel and Jehoash are called "Saviours." Does this prove that they possessed supreme divinity? Again, because David says, "The Lord (Jehovah) is my shepherd, I shall not want," and Isaiah, speaking of the Messiah, says, "He shall feed his flock like a shepherd," therefore Christ must be God! Again, Ezekiel calls God "the husband of the church;" and John, in allusion to Jesus, says, "He that hath the bride is the bridegroom;" therefore God and Jesus are one! Again, few names or epithets are more frequently applied to God in the Old Testament, than that of "Redeemer." He "redeemed Israel" from Egyptian bondage; the "Most High God was their redeemer;" "as for our redeemer, the Lord of hosts is his name." But Christ, in the New Testament, is said to have redeemed us; we "have redemption through him," therefore, so argues the Bishop, with apparent seriousness, "Christ Jesus is the Lord of hosts." God, too, is called a "preserver," or

* p. 80.

is said to "preserve"; Job says, "What shall I do unto thee, O thou Preserver of men?" "Preserve me, O God," says the Psalmist. But Christians are said to be "sanctified and *preserved* in Jesus Christ." "What plainer evidence can be asked," exclaims the Bishop, "to prove that in this also the Saviour is shown to be divine?"* And he goes on to fill page after page with such stuff. But our readers will be satisfied, we think, with the above specimens, which, so far as the proof of the Trinity is concerned, are just about on a level with the "three measures of parched corn," the three spies, entertained by Rahab, or the three daughters of Job.†

The Bishop's illustrations of the Trinity, too, bear a striking analogy to several of those employed by the Fathers, but which have been generally abandoned by modern Trinitarians, as going to destroy either the trinity or the unity, and as therefore not suited to their purpose. But the Bishop is not disconcerted by trifles. One of his illustrations is intended to show that there is no contradiction in saying that three is one. "Take," says he, "the sun in the firmament, and you will find that it is three and one. There is, first, the round orb; secondly, the light; thirdly, the heat. Each one of these we call the sun. When you say, that the sun is almost 900,000 miles in diameter, you speak of the round orb; when you say, that the sun is bright, you mean the light; when you say, that the sun is warm, you mean the heat. The orb is the sun, the light is the sun, and the heat is the sun; and they all mean different things, and still there is but one sun. Here is a manifest trinity and unity even in a material substance, known and understood by all, yet it is just as open to objection as the

---

* p. 36.

† The Bishop's scriptural argument to prove that Christ instituted two orders of the priesthood is of a similar character. Thus, Christ commissioned the twelve Apostles (Luke ix); "but," says Bishop Hopkins, "in the very next chapter we read, that 'after these things the Lord *appointed seventy others also*, and sent them two and two before his face, into every city and place whither he himself would come.'" The former, that is, the Twelve, according to him, were the head (under Christ, the Chief Shepherd and Bishop of souls,) of the sacred order of Bishops; the latter, that is, the Seventy, of the ordinary priests or elders! "And we see," says he, "how soon they supplied the third order, by the appointment of deacons." On so slight a foundation does he rear the magnificent fabric of Diocesan Episcopacy. — *The Primitive Church*, &c., pp. 194 — 198.

Christian doctrine, that the Father is God, and the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God; yet these are different persons, while, nevertheless, there is but one God." *

Was there ever such egregious trifling? Here is one sun, contemplated as producing two different effects, occasioning in us the sensations of light and heat. But what is all this to the purpose? We may say, according to the old theory, that light is a part, or an emanation of the sun; or it is the effect of its presence in our system; and so of heat, it is an effect of its presence. But we do not, and cannot without absurdity, say that each of them *is* the sun itself, using the term constantly in the same sense. When the Bishop says, that the "round orb is the sun, the light is the sun, and the heat is the sun," yet there are "not three suns, but one sun," he must either utter nonsense, or he uses the same term in different senses in his several affirmations. Will he admit the latter supposition in regard to the proposition which the example is adduced to illustrate? When he says, "The Father is God, and the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, yet there are not three Gods, but one God," will he admit that the term God changes its signification in each of these allegations? If not, the illustration is nothing to his purpose. It is either not true, or not applicable except in a sense, which would annihilate the Trinity.

His two next illustrations are, if any thing, still more unfortunate. Thus he asks, "Is not every man living an example of a trinity and unity in his own person? Has he not a soul, a rational mind, and a body?"—"Each of these we call the man, and they are all different from each other, and yet there are not three men, but one man." Again, "Even in the very mind itself, according to the old system of metaphysics, we may discover another, and perhaps on some accounts, a closer illustration. There is the judgment, the memory, and the imagination, three faculties, each of which we call mind."—"Yet, although each is called mind, there are not three minds, but one mind!" †

In these illustrations, the objection before mentioned again occurs. The terms are used in different senses in different parts of the statement, and some of them in very strange senses too, and such as we venture to say were never before attributed to them. The Bishop enumerates three modes in

* p. 20. † pp. 20, 21.

which the mind acts, three states, or operations, or, if he will, three "faculties." To each of these, if his illustration has any pertinency, he must attribute all the attributes of mind. He must say of memory, for example, that it thinks, compares, combines, and of itself performs all mental acts. And so of the rest. Nor do we see why he should limit himself to a triple division, for there are several other faculties or states of mind, which are just as much entitled to be called mind, as memory, imagination, and judgment. It would be just as easy to draw an illustration from the mind and its faculties to prove that seven is one, and one is seven, that black is white, or white is black, as that three is one, and one is three.

In illustration of the procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son, the Bishop again reverts to the luminary of day. Thus, he says, "It is not denied by any that the orb sends forth the light," and, by a "common figure of speech," might be called "the Father of the light." Here, then, is the Father and the Son. Then "the heat of the sun proceeds from the orb, *and likewise from the light*," as the Holy Ghost, from the Father and the Son!* Our readers, we suppose, will expect no commentary on this.

These illustrations can be matched only by some of those we find in the old Fathers. The "disk of the sun, a beam, and light," constituted, according to one of their comparisons, a type of the Trinity. God created man, says one of them, in his own image, that he might exhibit the "mystery of the Trinity" in the human soul, a pattern of himself. Augustine finds an emblem of the same in the "soul, reason, and spirit," and again, in "memory, intellect, and love"; others, in the "soul, its intellect, and its desire," and finally, in the "rational,

---

* p. 21. The Bishop is consistent in expressing his contempt of metaphysics. "So far as metaphysical objections may be concerned," he says, "we make but small account of them in theology." p. 319. Our readers will by this time have suspected as much. For this, however, he assigns a somewhat curious reason. It is, that "the science of mental philosophy was never in a more unsettled state than at the present moment." An "unsettled state"! Therefore, according to our present conception of the human faculties, and of the fundamental laws of belief, a doctrine may be metaphysically absurd, yet theologically true, since those conceptions may be all erroneous. This is worthy the good African Bishop, who found his faith in a certain part of the doctrine of the Trinity marvellously quickened by the circumstance that the thing to be believed was impossible.

irascible, and concupiscible faculties." Gregory of Nyssa, we believe, claims the credit of the last.

The Bishop flatters himself, that by giving the creeds, and a few other extracts from the remains of the first four centuries, he has established the position that the doctrine of a trinity in unity was uniformly asserted by the earlier Fathers, and he indulges in some rather harsh expressions towards those who deny this position. He charges them with "ignorance and contempt of antiquity"; he is "equally grieved and astonished," he tells us, "by the delusion which affects to discover the anti-trinitarian doctrine in the records of Christian antiquity." "An occasional line, an unguarded expression, or a few garbled extracts," it seems, are all to which those, who "*affect*" to find traces of this doctrine in the writings of the Fathers, are accustomed to appeal!*

The charge of ignorance of Christian antiquity would come with better grace from almost any other man than from the Bishop of the diocese of Vermont. In truth, he totally misconceives the tenor and spirit of the writings of the period to which he alludes, partly from inattention to the circumstance that the force and signification of terms and phrases perpetually change with time. The meaning of language is in a state of continual mutation, while the written letter remains unaltered. Words, it is well known, are often retained, long after the ideas originally conveyed by them have disappeared, or have become essentially modified. This is especially the case, when the subject, about which they are employed, is attended with any intrinsic obscurity.

The consequences of not attending to this fact are obvious. Terms and expressions occur in an ancient writing, which, according to their modern and obvious use, with which habit has rendered us familiar, suggest to our minds certain ideas, or awaken a particular train of associations. Now, if we take it for granted that these terms and expressions were connected in the mind of the author of the writing with the same ideas and associations, that is, that they were used by him in their present and acquired sense, we shall be liable, it is evident, perpetually to mistake his meaning. To take a comparatively modern instance, the English word *worship*, at the time our present version of the Bible was made, was used to express, not only

* p. 310.

divine homage, but civil respect. This latter meaning is now nearly or quite obsolete. But the word bears this sense several times in our English Bibles, and frequently in the writings of the period to which the translation belongs, and of preceding times. It is easy to see into what blunders, a careless reader, or one acquainted only with the signification of the term as now generally used, and not suspecting it of ever bearing any other, who should sit down to read those writings, would fall, in consequence of this ambiguity of the term.

This is not the only circumstance which has been the occasion of important misapprehensions of the language of the Fathers. Their writings are attended with peculiar obscurity, in consequence of the intellectual habits, and prevailing philosophical systems, of the period at which they were produced. To ascertain an author's meaning with any tolerable exactness, it is often necessary to know something of the modes of thinking and feeling peculiar to his age. If he wrote on theological subjects, it is important to become acquainted with the theological and philosophical opinions of his times, or those which were current in the schools in which he was educated, and among the class of writers whose works constituted his favorite reading.

Now, as the early Fathers, generally, were educated in the schools of the later Platonists, or were strongly tinctured with the opinions of those schools, and borrowed from them several terms, some of which they employed to express the most subtile and obscure ideas which entered into their theology, some acquaintance with the philosophy of the Alexandrian Platonists, as well as with Jewish literature and opinions, becomes absolutely necessary to a correct interpretation of their language. We do not say, that this is the only sort of learning necessary to a right understanding of the Fathers, but this is indispensable, and without it all other is unavailing.

Several expressions in use among Trinitarians of the present day occur in the writings of the Fathers of the second, third, and fourth centuries. Bishop Hopkins all along assumes, that these expressions were used by them in their modern sense. If he will look a little deeper into Christian antiquity, he will find ample evidence that they were employed by the Fathers in a sense widely different from their present.

Take, for example, the terms "unity," "one." Nothing is susceptible of clearer proof than that the Fathers, when they

speak of the Son as one with God, refer not to a numerical, but only to a specific identity, or oneness. All they meant was, that the Son partook of one and the same specific nature with the Father, that is, a divine; just as two individuals of our race partake of one and the same specific nature, that is, a human; divine begetting divine, as human begets human. They never regarded them as constituting numerically one being. Modern Trinitarians use the term as referring to a numerical identity. Of this the Fathers never dreamed. They found no difficulty in calling the Son "God," for, according to the prevailing views of the age, the term did not necessarily imply self-existence. The Son was God, as they explained it, in virtue of his birth, his derivation from the Father, the divine nature being transmitted. So Justin Martyr, speaking of the Son says, "who, since he is the first-begotten *logos* of God, is God." *

Another term employed in connection with the Trinity, and the use of which tends to mislead, is *hypostasis*, understood by the moderns in the theological sense of *person* as distinguished from substance, but uniformly by the old Fathers in the sense of essence. Thus, when they call the Father and the Son two *hypostases*, they mean two in essence, that is, constituting two real beings. †

Again, the creed of Nice tells us that the Son is *consubstantial*, of the same substance, with the Father. But this term was used by the Fathers not in its modern sense, but in the old Platonic signification, to express, as we have said, specific sameness of nature, sameness of kind, similarity, likeness. The Son was of like nature with the Father, not numerically the same being. So the Fathers of Nice, as Eusebius, in his letter to his people tells us, understood the term. So it was used by the council of Chalcedon, if their language has any consistency; and so Athanasius himself, in his earlier writings, distinctly explains it, taking the examples of a man and a dog. One man, he tells us, is consubstantial with another, and so is one dog; but a dog and a man are not consubstantial.‡

The epithet *eternal*, sometimes applied to the Son, was ambiguous, meaning, as the Fathers sometimes used it, simply

* Apol. I. p. 94. Thirlb.

† See some references on this point in a former Number; Vol. VI. (New Series.) p. 36, note.

‡ See Christian Examiner, Vol. VII. (New Series.) pp. 338–340.

before the world was. Whenever, in speaking of the Son, they used it in its strict sense, it was in reference to a notion generally entertained by them, that the Son had, from all eternity, a sort of potential existence in the Father, that is, as an attribute, his *logos*, reason, or wisdom, which, by a voluntary act of the Father a little before the creation, was converted into a real being, and became his instrument in forming the world.

Bishop Hopkins does not discriminate. He throughout goes on the supposition, as we have said, that the language, which occurs in the writings of the Fathers respecting the Father, Son, and Spirit, was uniformly employed by them in its modern and acquired signification.*

* In his book on the "Primitive Church," the third named at the head of this article, in which he undertakes the defence of Episcopacy, the Bishop manifests the same want of discrimination in regard to the use of terms and expressions. Thus, because the terms *bishop* and *presbyter* occur in ancient Christian writings, he assumes it as a fact that two distinct orders of the priesthood then existed. Yet nothing is capable of clearer proof, than that the terms were at first used indiscriminately to designate one order, and for some time after the term *bishop* came to be appropriated to the first or presiding Presbyter, no such thing as a diocesan Bishop was known. The only existing Bishops were parochial, or congregational Bishops, having charge of a single parish or community of believers, worshipping together in one place, much like our present congregational ministers, who, according to the primitive use of the term, are strictly Bishops, and correspond to the ancient Bishops. See Christian Examiner, Vol. XII. (New Series.) pp. 177 *et seqq.*

Bishop Hopkins has high hierarchical notions, and talks with great complacency of Ecclesiastical Judicatories. His Defence of Episcopacy, however, partakes of most of the defects of his other publications. It is a little more courteous in tone than parts of his book on the "Primitive Creed," but it abounds in flimsy arguments and unsupported assertions, and is written wholly for effect. It is of an exceedingly miscellaneous character, and contains some very just observations, and others which fill us with surprise.

Some of his objections to the efforts made to promote "what is called the Temperance Reform," are curious, and, so far as we know, novel. He starts fairly with the assertion, that, according to his "views of the subject, the Episcopal Church is justified in taking no part in the Temperance Reform" One reason is, that the "Temperance Society" is not a "Christian Society," and is not therefore to be encouraged. p. 132. Then "if the Temperance Society," he says, "should succeed to the extent of its anticipation, *it would be a triumph to infidelity.*" — "It would demonstrate what the Infidel has always been asserting, that *Christianity is not of God.*" p. 138. Now we do not, any more than Bishop Hopkins, approve *all* the measures adopted to promote the Reform, but

The current language (not occasionally an "unguarded expression") of all the Ante-Nicene Fathers, understood according to correct principles of interpretation, shows that they held the Son to be inferior to the Father and a distinct being from him, and the Nicene creed teaches no other doctrine. It is not our purpose at present to exhibit the evidence from the writings of the Fathers in proof of this statement. This has been attempted in some former numbers of our journal, the references to which we give below.*

The Bishop's confident assertion that the early Fathers were sound on the subject of the Trinity, according to modern apprehensions of the doctrine, is worth just about as much as his assertion, equally confident, relating to the origin of the Apostles' Creed. Others, sound Trinitarians too, and perfectly competent from their learning to decide, state the matter differently. Will Bishop Hopkins charge Petavius, author of the *Dogmata Theologica*, with ignorance of Christian antiquity? Was Huet, bishop of Avranches, and author of the *Origeniana*,

---

we confess it never occurred to us, that, should these measures succeed in making all men sober and temperate, Christianity would thereby be endangered.

* See articles on Justin Martyr, Origen, and Arius and Arianism, particularly, (New Series,) Vol. II. pp. 303 — 327, Vol. VI. pp. 23 — 40, and Vol VII. pp. 299 — 344.

The Trinity of the Fathers differed from the modern doctrine, in the following particulars: First, as regards the Father and Son, they asserted, in the first place, the real subordination and inferiority of the latter to the former in his whole nature. As a real person, or individual being, they did not, in the second place, hold the proper eternity of the Son, though they believed that, as an attribute or property of the Father, which in their view he originally was, he had always subsisted, since there never was a time when the Father was without reason, wisdom, *logos*. In the third place, they did not admit that the Son was numerically the same being with the Father, but only of the same specific or common nature, that is, divine, being not God himself, but by birth and derivation like him, as a human being is like the parent, or of like nature with him, in this sense, consubstantial. In regard to the Spirit, the difference was still greater.

Of this disparity, admitted by learned Trinitarians, the Bishop takes no notice. Yet, until it can be disproved, it is an abuse of language, a fallacy, a gross imposition, to affirm that the Fathers bear uniform testimony to the Trinity. To prove this, it is necessary to show, not merely that the expressions still current on the subject are found in the writings of the early Fathers, but that these expressions were used by them in the sense they now bear among approved Trinitarians, a task which has never yet been accomplished, and never will be.

ignorant? Was Cudworth ignorant? Yet with these, and several others we could name, good Trinitarians too, the Bishop of Vermont, if he will condescend to read them, will find himself directly at issue.

Petavius adduces a great mass of evidence to show that the most distinguished of the Fathers, before the council of Nice, taught the inferiority of the Son to the Father, and of the Spirit to the Son.*

"Certainly," says Huet, "Tatian, and an older than Tatian, Justin, taught erroneous views of the Trinity." Theophilus of Antioch, he says, "falls under the same censure." With others it was still worse. "For," he continues, "things shameful and not to be endured were uttered by Tertullian and Lactantius, as also by Clement, Dionysius, and Pierius of Alexandria, and many others." When Bellarmine, he says still further, "defends Origen on the ground that, his preceptor Clement, and his disciples Dionysius of Alexandria and Gregory Thaumaturgus, being sound and orthodox, we are authorized to infer that the same doctrine which he received from Clement, he himself held and transmitted to his followers, he could have said nothing more injurious to the cause of Origen, for no one of the three held the Trinity in its purity and integrity. For Clement so distinguished between the substance of the Father and that of the Son as to make the latter inferior, and Dionysius said the Son was a creation (work) of the Father, and dissimilar to him, and spake unbecomingly of the Spirit, as we are told by Basil, who also censures Gregory Thaumaturgus for teaching plainly that the Son was created." "Finally," he says, "it is evident, that not indeed in the days of Basil, and even in times more recent, did the Catholics dare openly profess the divinity of the Spirit."†

We might multiply quotations of a similar import from modern Trinitarian writers, whom it will not do for Dr. Hopkins to charge with ignorance of antiquity.‡ Several of the

* See, particularly, De Trinitate, Lib. I. c. 3, 4, 5. Bishop Hopkins says, that Petavius, as a Catholic, was interested in depressing the ancient Fathers, as the Protestants made use of them in the Popish controversy. The Bishop must be aware that this is not to refute him.

† Huet. Orig. Lib. II. Qu. 2, § 10.

‡ Professor Stuart has recently made some statements on this subject, which, coming from such a source, are worthy of notice, and we

Fathers themselves, and some of those to whom he has appealed as authorities, are against him; for they roundly tax the more ancient Fathers, to whom he also appeals, with unsoundness on the subject of the Trinity. One of his authorities is Origen. We have seen what Huet thought of him. Jerome thought no better; for he accuses him of asserting that the Son

---

commend them to the attention of the Bishop. They occur in the articles on Schleiermacher, in the numbers of the "Biblical Repository and Quarterly Observer" for April and July, 1825. They are at variance with the Professor's former statements relating to the opinions of the early Fathers. He thinks them more accurate, as they are the result of a more intimate acquaintance with the writings of the Fathers. The views of the Nicene Fathers, he tells us, "if he understands them," do "really and effectually interfere with the true equality in substance, power, and glory, of the three persons or distinctions in the Godhead." The Son and Spirit, he says, according to them, are derived beings, and derivation implies inferiority. "A derived God," he says, "cannot be a self-existent God." The *numerical* identity of the Father and Son, he affirms, was not a doctrine of the ancient Fathers. "Justin," he observes, "says in so many words that the *logos* (Son) is different from the Father, and *another in number*." In regard to the unity and distinction of the Father and Son, he says, the "zeal of Origen led him to a theory in no important respect better than that of Arius." "Such was the case, too, with Eusebius the historian," and "Dionysius names the Son a *creation* and *work* of the Father." The council of Nice, he says, according to Athanasius, "did not mean to assert the *numerical* unity of the Godhead," and much more to the same purpose. The result is, that the Fathers generally, before and at the council of Nice, asserted the Son to be inferior to the Father, and *numerically* a different being from him. So says Professor Stuart!

We are aware that the Professor is no favorite with the Bishop. He is accused by him of recommending "the ministers of Christ to study the most revolting and impious writers of the German school," while he takes credit to himself "for the language of absolute contempt" towards the ancient Fathers, and of sundry other heinous offences, one of which is a disposition, imbibed from those same Germans, to "make concessions for which he receives no acknowledgment either from friend or foe!" The Bishop thinks, that, if the Professor had studied the German theology less, and the Fathers more, "the change would have been in favor of his soundness and learning, — his strength and power," and "he probably would have wielded a weapon against error, of far higher temper and keener edge," and "there would have been none of his present disregard, not to say contempt, for the learning and judgment of the Fathers, and the authority of the Primitive Church!"

It is somewhat diverting to hear the Bishop of Vermont gravely lecturing Professor Stuart on his ignorance of the writings of the Fathers. We do not suppose, that the Professor surpasses all that are, or have been, in the accuracy and extent of his knowledge of those writings, nor do we know that he claims for himself any such distinction. But

was "not begotten, but made."* The Bishop quotes and extols Basil the Great. What was Basil's opinion of the Ante-Nicene Fathers? What he says of Dionysius and Gregory Thaumaturgus, another of the Bishop's authorities, has been just quoted. Of Dionysius he says further, that he "sowed the seeds of the Anomœan (Arian) impiety; for he not only made a diversity of persons between the Father and the Son, but a difference of essence, taking away their consubstantiality." The same Basil admits, that the old Fathers were "silent" on the question of the Spirit; and says, that they who acknowledged its divinity in his day were "condemned as introducing novel dogmas on the subject." Rufinus accuses Clement of Alexandria of calling the Son a "creature," and Dionysius, he says, "in his zeal against Sabellianism, fell into Arianism." Origen admits, that there might be a few in his day who pronounced the Saviour to be "God over all," but this, he expressly tells us they did rashly, and that it was by no means the common sentiment. "Grant," says he, "that among the multitude of believers there are some, who, differing from others, rashly affirm the Saviour to be God over all; we do not acknowledge him as such, for we believe him when he said, 'The Father, who sent me, is greater than I.'"† This, Origen, as did the Ante-Nicene Fathers, we believe, without exception, understood as spoken of Christ's whole, or superior nature.

Such (and we might add to the number) are some of the authorities among the Fathers in direct opposition to the Bishop. Were these Fathers "ignorant of Christian antiquity?" They were themselves ancient, "primitive," according to the Bishop's standard. Have they then borne false witness of each other and of themselves? This supposition is hardly consistent with the title to exalted veneration the Bishop so freely accords to them.‡

---

we should like to see the Bishop measure strength with him in a contest requiring the use of weapons drawn from the armory of the Fathers. If we do not greatly mistake, the author of the "Primitive Creed Examined and Explained" would, in a very short time, find himself unhorsed.

* Epist. 59. Ad Avitum.

† Adv. Cels. Lib. 8.

‡ It is amusing to find, that Bishop Hopkins, quoting Eusebius the historian, as an undoubted Trinitarian, and quoting too from his Letter to his people from Nice, which, if it is to be trusted (and it is confirmed in the main by the testimony of Athanasius), shows that neither Euse-

The Bishop is not more fortunate in his appeal to councils. They all, if we may believe him, including the Arian and the Semi-Arian of the fourth century, bear testimony in his favor. He specifies several. First, the second council of Antioch, holden A. D. 341. But this council expressly declared against the Nicene faith, rejected the term *consubstantial*, and in favor of their own views appealed to the testimony of antiquity.* The term was rejected also from the creed of the third council of Sirmium, which, says Du Pin, is Arian, but which Hosius, long one of the pillars of the Nicene faith, in an evil hour, as the orthodox will have it, signed. Sad fall indeed. It was anathematized by the council of Philippopolis; condemned by that of Antioch holden soon after; by the fifth of Sirmium; by those of Seleucia and Ariminum (Rimini), and others. In regard to the council of Ariminum the Bishop's statement is as trustworthy as usual. He says, that, notwithstanding the efforts of the Arians, and the "influence of the Emperor, and the apprehension of banishment and persecution," the four hundred Bishops assembled there "determined to adhere to the Nicene confession, and solemnly republished it as the symbol of the Catholic faith."† And yet, notwithstanding their "determination," and their "republication," if the Bishop will have it so, "of the Nicene confession," it is quite certain that these Bishops generally, before the council broke up, did recede from the determination, violate their constancy, and sign a creed of a very different import, being one recently drawn up at Sirmium, in opposition to the Nicene symbol. Du Pin says, that "*all* the bishops signed," and thus, says he, "ended this council, whose beginning was glorious, and end deplorable."‡

And yet Bishop Hopkins is not ashamed to ask "the enemies of Trinitarians to point out only one council which

---

bius nor the council were orthodox in the modern sense of the term. Eusebius was in no good repute for orthodoxy among the Fathers. "An Arian," says Athanasius; the "Prince of Arians," exclaims Jerome; "an Arian, and worse than an Arian," adds Nicephorus. For some remarks on this subject, see Christian Examiner, Vol. XIII. (New Series.) pp. 98, 99.

* Soc. Lib. II. c. 10. Soz. Lib. III. c. 5.

† p. 310.

‡ History of Eccles. Writers, Vol. II. p. 264. To the time of the abovementioned council Jerome refers, when he says, the whole world groaned to find itself Arian.

adopted their sentiments." That the council of Rimini before its close, and others just named, and more we might mention, were Anti-trinitarian, we want no better evidence than the fact that they openly declared against the Nicene creed, and uniformly condemned and rejected from their symbols the term *consubstantial*, which had been from the first exceedingly obnoxious to the Arians, but which the orthodox made the very watchword of their party. If the Bishop, by appealing to the Arians as testifying in favor of the Trinity, really means to intimate that they held the doctrine in a form satisfactory to him, it is all very well. We will not contend with him on that point. But if the Arian doctrine differs from the orthodox, to what purpose this appeal to the authority of the Arians? It is wholly deceptive. The Bishop may be satisfied with Arian expositions, but they cannot nevertheless be considered as expositions of the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity. Of his Trinity they may.*

We will follow the Bishop no further in his book of the "Primitive Creed Examined and Explained." Several of his remaining statements are no nearer the truth, and no better substantiated, than those already noticed. We have given our readers a sufficient specimen of the contents of the volume, and have said enough, we trust, to show the sort of credit to which the author's assertions are entitled, and the admirable modesty evinced by him in charging all who differ from him

---

* The Arians, it seems, believed in a Trinity! Undoubtedly they did. And so do we. But not a trinity in unity; nor did they. We believe in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; and so did they. But we do not believe that these three are numerically one or equal; nor did they, nor any of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. Though these Fathers held language respecting the Father and the Son of which the Arians disapproved, they stopped short, as we have before said, of the doctrine of the numerical identity of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit. We challenge Dr. Hopkins to produce a single writer of any note, during the first three ages, who held this doctrine.

We beg to assure the Bishop, however, that we do not consider the Athanasian creed as evidence of the faith of *primitive* antiquity exactly, though he is pleased to give it as such, transcribing damnatory clauses and all. He quotes it as a genuine relic of antiquity, and means that his readers shall believe that it is really a production of Athanasius himself. He roundly asserts that it was "published at Rome, A. D. 340"! Of this there is not the least shadow of proof, the statements of Baronius and some other Romish writers of the same stamp being wholly unsupported. Neither Athanasius, nor any writer of his own or of the next century, ever alludes to it in any of their writings now

respecting the opinions of the earlier Fathers, with "ignorance and contempt of antiquity."

In regard to the "Discourses on the Evidences," the second work, the title of which is given at the head of the present article, a word must suffice. The Bishop's motive in the publication is unquestionably good, but there is nothing either in the matter or style which gives it any decided claim to approbation. It is not particularly adapted to meet the wants of the age, and it contains several erroneous statements, which may have been the result of accident, but which we confess have strongly the appearance of design. Like some of those already noticed in the volume on the "Creed," they wear too much the aspect of "pious frauds," as they are termed, which, whatever may have been thought of them in former times, will hardly, we suppose, be openly defended, at the present day, as useful for the edification of the Christian, or the conversion of the infidel. Some of them are very gross.

It is painful to be under the necessity of calling attention to statements of the kind alluded to. We regret exceedingly to meet them in treatises designed to set forth the evidences of our faith, for by means of them religion is wounded in the house of its friends. No cause can be permanently benefited by arguments which rest on falsehood as their basis. Truth and sincerity are the only weapons we may lawfully use. As long as we can wield these, let us contend, but not one moment longer; for no longer will Christ own us as his true champions, or heaven's blessing crown our arms.

We cannot take leave of the author of the works, which

---

extant. No mention of it occurs of a date prior to the sixth century, and some of the writings in which we find the earliest allusions to it are of doubtful genuineness. In regard to Athanasius, says Du Pin, "all the world agrees it was none of his, but of some authors who lived a long time after him. — It is certain, that it was composed after the council of Chalcedon," A. D. 451. (Hist. Eccles. Writers, Vol. IV. pp. 35, 36.) "That which is called the creed of Athanasius," says Pretyman, "certainly was not written by that Father." "It was never heard of till the 6th century, above a hundred years after the death of Athanasius." "It cannot now be ascertained who was its real author; — it had never the sanction of any council." — (Elements of Christian Theology, Vol. II. p. 219.) It was "the composition," says Dr. Samuel Clarke, "of an uncertain obscure author, written (not certainly known whether) in Greek or Latin, in one of the darkest and most ignorant ages of the church." (Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, p. 447, ed. Lond. 1712.)

have called forth our present remarks, without expressing our chagrin and mortification, that writers, belonging to a reputable profession, and wearing some external badges of distinction in that profession, should continue to give to the public, productions, exhibiting so little evidence of theological learning, correct taste, or habits of clear and forcible reasoning. Their appearance certainly is not creditable to the theological literature of our country. Their publication, from time to time, leads us occasionally to doubt whether the progress in just principles of biblical criticism and interpretation, of which some of our theological seminaries, and the writings of a few individuals among us, give abundant proof, is shared by any large portion of our religious teachers, or whether the public is yet to any very wide extent benefited by such progress, whatever it be. It would be difficult to point out a passage in the writings which have been just now under consideration, in which the author has been indebted for a single excellence, to the efforts of the human mind in theology, criticism, or historical research, for the last hundred years. In regard to solidity and justness of thought, learning, arrangement, style, and general fairness and candor, his productions are far inferior to those of Pearson and Barrow on the Creed, Paley on the Evidences, and others of a similar character which might be named. When the Bishop, in reference to the remark often made, that the best Trinitarian critics now generally admit that the occurrence, in the Old Testament, of one of the names of the Deity in the plural form, proves nothing as to a plurality of persons in the Divinity, says that it is "questionable whether this point *is* generally conceded," and "more than questionable whether it ever ought to be," he furnishes, we think, a key to the course he is determined to pursue, that is, to surrender not the least particle of the traditionary opinions which make in his favor, though they should be proved, with the clearness of mathematical demonstration, to be utterly repugnant to reason and fact. On no other principle can we explain his adherence to the old fabulous accounts of the origin of the Apostles' and the Athanasian Creeds, and the numerous other vestiges, constantly recurring in his writings, of antiquated hypotheses, and worn-out and exploded absurdities. A. L.

Art. VI.—*On the Penitentiary System in the United States, and its Application in France; with an Appendix on Penal Colonies, and also Statistical Notes.* By G. de Beaumont and A. de Tocqueville, Counsellors in the Royal Court of Paris, and Members of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Translated from the French, with an Introduction, Notes, and Additions. By Francis Lieber. Philadelphia: Carey, Lea, & Blanchard. 1833. 8vo. pp. 301.

It is consoling, when one has been contemplating the mischiefs, the follies, the guilt, and the suffering, which abound in the world, to turn the thoughts to those symptoms of improvement in the state of society, which here and there may be discerned. It is a consolation which is necessary for the encouragement of such as are willing to contribute their share of labor in advancing the best interests of their fellow men; for, if it be otherwise, if, in spite of effort and the use of reasonable means, there is no improvement; if, as we are sometimes told, the world grows worse and worse, more and more accomplished in the arts of corruption, and less disposed to what is really and permanently good, why should any one persevere in the hopeless task? Why should we toil for those who cannot, will not, be benefited? This is the natural tendency of those assertions and arguments we sometimes hear from men, who think themselves profound observers, and who do not hesitate to assure you, that, when you have attained equal experience and wisdom with themselves, you will be satisfied that the progress of the world is nothing more than an improvement of physical condition arising rather from the operation of selfishness than any higher motive, and that in all moral qualities we are far inferior to those who preceded us, and that our children will, in all probability, be worse than ourselves;

> "Ætas parentum, pejor avis, tulit
> Nos nequiores, mox daturos
> Progeniem vitiosiorem."

For ourselves, we think with very little reverence of the philosophy which leads to such conclusions. It is always easier to find fault than to discern merit. When we hear a critic haranguing on the defects of a work of art, we cannot but

suspect him of not being able to understand or appreciate the talent displayed in it; and for the same reason, when we hear a philosopher descanting on the increasing evil in the world, we are inclined to ascribe it, in part at least, to his incapacity to see or comprehend the better tendencies of our nature. We are not going to launch upon the boundless ocean of discussion on the comparative state of society at different periods; but we have been led to the thought we have expressed, by what we must regard as a remarkable instance of the spirit of moral as well as physical improvement in the present age. When before, in the history of the world, was a mission sent from the government of one powerful nation to another, to examine, not the dock-yards, the manufactures, or munitions of war, not into the sources of revenue or system of taxation, but into the condition of the most degraded class of the community, those who have heretofore been beneath the reach of the sympathy of even the meanest member of the community? How long is it since the condition of the prisoner has been thought worthy anybody's attention beside his keeper's? Shall we go back to the unsophisticated virtue of Roman, Grecian, Egyptian, or Hindoo antiquity, to recover traces of the humanity which our own age has lost? Or shall we learn a lesson from the still ruder, untaught kindness of the savage, whose customs have descended from an era of unmeasured remoteness? Or is this seemingly philanthropic mission only another form of the selfishness so universal? Do people wish to find out the most effectual system of imprisonment in order merely that themselves may live in greater security? When selfishness takes this shape of prudent forecast, of regard for the welfare of the many, and of justice without cruelty to the guilty, we are ready to call it a virtue of a high order. It is the same sort of selfishness which makes us desire the happiness arising from any right conduct, and which we wish to see increasing and extending perpetually. It is, moreover, highly creditable to this country, that it should be looked up to by foreigners as taking the lead in the reform of prison discipline, and that commissioners should be sent hither by a people among the most forward in all points of civilization, to make inquiries on the spot into the character of our penitentiary institutions, with a view to the improvement of their own.

The report drawn up by Messrs. de Beaumont and de

Tocqueville is a document of much value; for it states facts and gives authorities for assertions, and thus enables one to come to results which may or may not agree with those of the authors. It does not display, so far as we could discover in perusal, much previous practical acquaintance with the subject. We doubt if the writers were familiar with the condition of the imprisoned criminal or debtor in their own country, before their appointment to inquire into the treatment of such persons here. They come to the subject with an air of freshness, which is, perhaps, no injury to the unprejudiced fairness of their views; and they talk often with a respect for theories, which a little wider practical knowledge might have materially affected. They obviously possess the best and kindest feelings, and the soundest views as to the general object to be effected by what is called Prison Discipline; but this is a matter in which, as in many others, it is not enough to wish to do right. The wisdom of the wisest will not be superfluous, nor the brotherly kindness of the most benevolent thrown away upon it. It is full of difficulties still, difficulties arising from the different views men take of the objects to be attained and sought by it, and the different means they are disposed to adopt for the accomplishment of those objects; as well as on account of the general want of interest in the condition of a degraded class of human beings, and the incredulity which very much prevails still, as to the amount of usefulness of the whole system.

If you ask what is the object of punishment, one will answer, to deprive the criminal of the power of repeating his offence; another will say, to deter others from the commission of crime; a third, simply, the security of society, without much regard to the means; and a fourth, the amendment of the guilty. Our answer to the question would be, the prevention of crime, in the widest possible sense of the words; its prevention for the future, as well in the convicted culprit himself as in all others. There are two objects to be attained, the one having reference to those within the walls of the prison, the other to those without. To affect the latter, the punishment must be severe enough to be dreaded; to affect the former, its severity must be tempered with so much of mildness as will prevent it from being of a hardening, brutalizing character. Nor should we stop here. Punishment should have a tendency to improve men, not to make them worse, nor keep them precisely where

they are. Then comes the great question, What are the best means of improving persons of such character as usually become inmates of prisons? In order to determine the proper answer to this, it is manifest that the first necessary preliminary is an acquaintance with the character of those to be influenced. Upon this point the greatest, the most fundamental, and most pernicious errors have been everywhere committed. Convicts have been considered as all of one character, and that the most hardened and degraded possible; as if nothing but total depravity could lead men to the commission of crime; as if offences against the laws of man were of so much deeper dye than those violations of the laws of God which escape the penitentiary; as if the power of sudden and strong temptation never led astray those who were prevailingly well-disposed; as if ignorance, and neglect, and bad company ought to have the same effect on the youthful mind, as instruction, care, and kind friends, and should be no excuse for the commission of offences the enormity of which the poor culprit was utterly incapable of appreciating; as if any man had a right to such confidence in his own righteousness, as to feel sure he might not have fallen as low under similar circumstances; or even, if that confidence were justifiable, as if he had a right, on that account, to shut out his fellow being from sympathy, and to harden himself against all feeling of another's infirmity.

The truth is, and happily it is a truth beginning to be felt and acknowledged, that there is a similar diversity of character to be found within the prison that exists outside of it; though, from the imperfection of human institutions, all are subjected alike to a uniform punishment. There is the young man, with habits not yet fixed in wrong, neglected perhaps, ignorant, and deserving rather compassion than harshness; there is the weak tool of another's cunning; the reckless, headlong reveller, suddenly stopped in his heedless course; there is the man of strong passions, and the victim of an almost national vice; as well as the cool, resolute villain, and the old, hardened, hopeless reprobate. But we take back the last epithet. No one is hopeless. As long as human nature remains as it is, some hidden corner of the blackest heart, if it can but be reached, will be found susceptible of good. The number of those who have "grown old in sin, and hardened in their crimes," is comparatively small; the majority of prisoners are young enough to have their characters materially affected by the circum-

stances under which they are placed, and the influences which may be brought to bear upon them. It is very certain, that, on the old systems of punishment, prisoners were made infinitely worse by the evil communications to which they were exposed. "Corrumpere et corrumpi" was the regular occupation of the jail, the galley, the penitentiary of former times; and is it credible, that any human being is capable of being made worse, and incapable of being made better? Can a young man be perverted by one course of education and example, and can he not be affected at all by an opposite influence? Let it be tried. Let the prisoner be brought, as far as possible, into a sound state of body, by wholesome diet, pure air, sufficient clothing, hard but not oppressive labor, and personal cleanliness. Then let all communications of evil be stopped, and all of good opened which it is practicable to give, and let this continue for several years; and then we shall be able to judge, whether some portion of ignorance may or may not be removed, whether some of those perverted hearts can or cannot be reclaimed, and whether or not any human being can be found absolutely incapable of improvement.

The experiment surely is worth trying; as no one will deny that the criminal and the prisoner make up an important class in the community, and few will doubt that the promise of good results is sufficiently encouraging to authorize the attempt. Nay, the experiment has been tried, and has already produced results that have greatly encouraged those who have interested themselves in the subject. Those corrupting communications, which effected so much mischief, have been prevented by requiring seclusion and silence. The health of the prisoner has been cared for, in all the circumstances of situation, exercise, clothing, and diet; religious instruction, both public and private, has been given, and the deplorable ignorance of many has been in some degree removed by enabling them to read; and the Bible has been furnished to all, and prayer and exhortation, and reproof and encouragement, have exerted their combined influences on all. And what has been the effect? Far greater and better than was anticipated by the judicious friends of the plan. Not a few insulated cases merely of improvement of character have occurred; but a much larger proportion than was expected to be reclaimed has been found greatly benefited. To not a few, their commitment to prison has been, under Providence, the means of purifying and ele-

vating them from vice, poverty, and ignorance, to respectability, comfort, and knowledge, and even the most obdurate have acquired habits of great value to themselves and others. What has been done may be repeated; and the importance of these improvements of character, and real reformations, cannot be too highly estimated, even if they be reckoned at the lowest number that any, the most incredulous, would fix. Compare this scheme with those of other times and other countries, with the cruelty, the neglect, the filth, the degrading and brutalizing vices, the insufficient food, and the foul air, to which the prisoner has been heretofore exposed, and shall we not rejoice at the change? When to these facts we add the important alteration in the expense of establishments for the imprisonment of criminals, when we learn that prisoners, instead of being a great and growing burden on the community, are actually a source of gain, we are ready to ask, is not this system precisely what we want? Would it not be chimerical to expect any thing better? Can there, indeed, be any thing better of the sort?

Yes, say Messrs. de Beaumont and de Tocqueville, there is one thing better; there is still an improvement on this plan; and that is, the absolute solitude of every individual confined, at least his absolute separation from every other prisoner. Let him see no one but his keeper, or a minister of the gospel; and let him reflect, in his cell, upon his past course and his future prospects; but, that his reflections may not be too intense, give him employment; and he will come out not only a better man, but with the advantage of not having been seen, known, and marked as a convict either by his associates or others. He will not, therefore, be exposed either to the temptations or the discouragements which await those who have not been in total solitude. It is found by experience, that nothing has a stronger tendency to soften the hard, stubborn, vicious character than absolute seclusion; and that is precisely the point to be obtained with the convict; while to those who know the difficulties to be encountered by the discharged prisoner, even if well disposed, — the temptations, the sneers of his old associates, and the abhorrence expressed by respectable people for an inmate of the State Prison, few things will seem more important than the protection of the unhappy convict from their oppressive power.

This experiment, too, has been tried. It was already begun when Messrs. de Beaumont and de Tocqueville were here in

1831; and so promising were its apparent advantages, that the plan received their decided approbation. Five years' experience since that time, has added to our acquaintance with this scheme and its effects; and we propose now to inquire whether those effects are, or can probably be made, so superior to those of the Auburn plan, as to justify the preference expressed for it by our authors, at the vast additional cost which it necessarily implies. We admit, as fully as can be desired, the advantages enjoyed by the prisoner discharged from the Philadelphia penitentiary of not having been known as its inmate. He is, as it were, new-born into the world; and, with his faculties fully developed, he has a new character to acquire; and it is his own fault if he do not adhere to the good resolutions he may have formed in his cell, and become thenceforward a useful citizen. But we think even this advantage, great as it is, may be purchased too dearly; and we are free to confess our opinion that the objections to the plan more than counterbalance this solitary point of superiority.

The first and most important defect in the scheme of constant confinement, is the impossibility of giving adequate religious instruction; we use these words advisedly, — the *impossibility* of giving *adequate* religious instruction. There is, probably, no equal number of human beings in civilized communities, who stand more in need of religious instruction, and of religious influence, in every possible shape, than the convicts in our penitentiaries. It was the want of this influence upon their minds in youth, which brought many of them, we are almost ready to say, all of them, to the cells they occupy; and without this influence it is in vain to hope for any valuable change in their characters. We agree perfectly with a remark of the warden of the Philadelphia Penitentiary in his last Report. "On few points have the community been more mistaken than in the character of convicts; who are, as a mass, an unfortunate, uneducated, ignorant class of beings, victims of intemperance and neglect. There are some instances among them of low cunning, but few of intelligence. A small number have received the first rudiments of a school education; *but the great majority, indeed nearly the whole, have been destitute of any thing like a moral or religious training.*" No wonder, then, that they are where they are, and what they are. Unhappy children of unnatural parents, it may still be a

mercy to them to become inmates of a cell, if the light of religion may there be poured on their darkened minds; if a faithful and wise teacher is allowed the means and opportunity of awaking, enlightening, exhorting, alarming, encouraging them, touching their hitherto insensible hearts with new emotions, sympathizing with them in their penitence, and raising their thoughts to Him whom, hitherto, they have not known in all their ways. None have so great need of such teachings, in all the various ways in which they can be given. The preaching of the word, the Sabbath school, the united prayer, and the private exhortation should all be regularly and diligently used. Too much cannot be done, and in neglecting any of these means of grace there is a loss not merely to the prisoner, but to society, which cannot be repaid in any other way. Now does the plan of the Philadelphia Penitentiary admit of the use of all these means? Manifestly not. The prisoners cannot be assembled for common instruction, either in the chapel or the Sabbath school. Whatever is done for them in that respect must be done by individual communication, or, at least, by the voice of a clergyman heard in the long passages through the small holes cut into the cells. In this way, thirty-six prisoners at once may, perhaps, hear the words addressed to an invisible audience; but no one can tell whether the prisoner chooses to listen or not.

And how is this amount of labor to be performed? On the 1st of January, 1836, there were three hundred and forty-four prisoners in the Penitentiary, thirty-six of whom only were in such situation as by any possibility to hear the same exhortation at the same time.* Is it expected of a clergyman to preach ten sermons on a Sabbath? Or are ten clergymen to be appointed to do what might be so much better done by one? We say better done, for it is past our belief that any man, however fervent and faithful, can preach to stone walls with holes in them, with the same efficacy as to a living assembly who will show in their countenances the effect of his words

* We are aware that a second story of cells has been built in some of the wings, by which the number is doubled. The intention was to give each prisoner two rooms, and so retain only the same number of convicts; but if this purpose has been changed, and a prisoner is placed in each cell, the number who may listen at once will be increased to seventy-two. The argument against the construction will still remain sufficiently strong.

on their hearts. And supposing a man to be found self-denying enough to undertake such a task, how long could he preach two sermons, or one sermon, in a week to all the prisoners? We really marvel at the coolness with which the Board of Inspectors, in their last Report, urge upon the legislature the appointment of *a* religious *instructor* for the Eastern Penitentiary. They say truly, that "the benefits of the system cannot be fully and completely exhibited without a systematic course of religious instruction." We think so too; and we think also that such instruction cannot be given in the Eastern Penitentiary, unless an officiating clergyman is appointed for each corridor, or the system of perpetual seclusion is given up, and the prisoners are assembled in a chapel. Believing, as we do, that religious instruction is indispensable to any valuable scheme of prison discipline, we unhesitatingly prefer that plan by which it may be and is given, according to which every prisoner may hear one or two sermons on the Sabbath, may have the benefit of the Sabbath school or Bible class, and may listen to daily prayers, to that on which all this is impracticable except at a cost, and with an apparatus, which only adds ridicule to impracticability.

The next point to which we wish to direct attention is the comparative healthiness of the two systems. Next in importance to the health of the soul is that of the body; and we should think it impossible to doubt, that the perpetual confinement to a small room is less healthy than active employment in the open air. We know that in the Appendix to the work of our authors, detailing their conversations with prisoners in this penitentiary, the improvement in their health is frequently mentioned, as it is also in every report of the officers of the institution. We have not the least doubt of it; but neither are we in the least satisfied by it. Health may be improved without becoming good; and it may be and often is what is called good health, or freedom from positive disease, when the subject is in that nervous, feeble, spiritless condition, showing any thing rather than what we should be disposed to call a sound, vigorous state of the body. The constant dwelling on the subject in all reports shows how great and natural a source of anxiety it has been to the patrons of the institution. Indeed it could not be otherwise. Everybody knows that confinement and sedentary occupations are not favorable to health. Look at those who are in better situations than the

convict; the mechanic, whose occupation confines him chiefly to one room, the shoemaker, the engraver, the artist, the student. Are they generally what would be called persons of good health; or are they commonly spoken of as delicate and feeble? Are they obliged to take great care of themselves, and are they frequently the victims of dyspepsia and consumption? None of these persons are necessarily confined to one room, twelve feet by eight; few of them sleep in their shops or their studies; none of them are compelled to use the same apartment for all purposes; yet they are generally delicate. How must it be with the prisoner, then, who eats, sleeps, and labors in the same little room? Is it possible for the air to be pure? Is it possible, that foulness should be entirely excluded? We do not ask these questions because we feel any doubt on the point. We have the best evidence, evidence on which we would believe any thing which human testimony is capable of establishing, that the atmosphere of those apartments is sometimes at least oppressive, and almost intolerable to those not accustomed to it. Is this right? Is this good for the health? Is this bad air, and generally sedentary occupation, as good for the prisoner as wielding the stone-hammer, the spade, or the pick-axe, in the open air? It certainly is very possible, that the average mortality may not exceed that of other prisons, and that the prisoner may live thus for a great length of time without becoming violently ill, especially when a careful system of diet is pursued; but he will necessarily fall into a state of what we should call low, rather than high health; and the produce of his day's labor will be very different from what it would be, were he more robust. The state of the mind is so associated with that of the body, that if the latter be debilitated, the former will be so too; and we may be producing, by our system of punishment, that weakness of character which will destroy the value of any reformation.

There is another point, connected with this of the healthiness of perpetual seclusion, on which we wish to speak guardedly and tenderly; but cannot suffer ourselves to pass it entirely over, particularly as we are reminded of it by every report from that prison. It is well known that solitary confinement, without occupation, has a strong tendency to produce insanity. It is a punishment greater than men can bear. Does the introduction of labor entirely remove that tendency? It is contended by the patrons of the scheme, that it does; and we

hope it may be so. We should, *à priori*, have some doubts on the point; and we will confess, that those doubts are not yet entirely removed. In the last report of the warden, there is a suggestion regarding the inmates of prisons generally, which we cannot but suspect took something of its tone from his personal observation in that particular prison. He says, many more of such persons, than is generally supposed, are really irresponsible, being either idiots or lunatics. Is it certain that the system of perpetual seclusion has no effect in increasing their number? We wish that all doubt on this point might be removed; for insanity is too dreadful an infliction to be suffered, as an effect of a plan for restoring to soundness the mind diseased by vice and crime. We desire to express ourselves clearly on the subject. There is no positive evidence before us, that insanity has been actually caused by the system pursued in the Philadelphia penitentiary; our doubts arise from the well-known fact, that it has been caused by seclusion without labor, and from our being unable to believe, without strong testimony to the fact, that labor alone is a sufficient antidote to the mental poison of perpetual solitude. If the directors of the prison can give us unequivocal proof of the safety of the plan with regard to this point, we shall rejoice that our speculative doubts are dispelled by the best of teachers, experience.

We come now to the consideration of a branch of the subject, of less importance than what we have spoken of, but still of sufficient weight to deserve serious attention in comparing the merits of the two systems. We should not, of course, place the pecuniary results of one in the scale against the more favorable moral results of the other; but when we find, that the plan, which, in our view, is best adapted to the success of the best influences, physical and intellectual, is also attended with very superior economical results, we confess that we think it an addition of no small importance to its merits. The earnings of the labor of all prisons conducted on the Auburn plan have been great; in most cases, more than sufficient to pay all expenses, including the salaries of the officers. The earnings of the prisoners at the Philadelphia penitentiary have thus far been by no means so satisfactory. According to the last Report of the President of the Board of Inspectors, the deficit for the year 1835 was $5,000, besides the salaries of the officers. It does not appear what the salaries amounted to; but the profits of the labor of an average of about two hundred

and eighty prisoners were $12,530·31, or about $44 each. In the Massachusetts State Prison, the earnings of the prisoners, last year, amounted to the sum of $37,707·48, or $135·66 each. The President, in his report, suggests to the legislature the propriety of furnishing capital to supply the means of purchasing materials, &c. On the system at present pursued, we fear the only result of such a step would be, that the expenses of the prison would be increased by the interest on that capital, whatever it might be.

But the difference between the two schemes does not arise merely from the difference in the results of the labor of the prisoners. The necessary expenses are very different also. We assert this without fear of contradiction, notwithstanding we have never seen, in any report of the Philadelphia penitentiary, a detailed statement of those expenses. The salaries of the officers not being stated, we will venture to presume that the amount is not less, in proportion to the number of prisoners, than that of penitentiaries conducted on the Auburn plan. It appears, by the Report of the Inspectors of the Sing Sing prison, for the year ending September 30th, 1832, (the first one, stating the fact, to which we can promptly refer,) that the salaries of the officers amounted to about $23,000 for an average of 900 prisoners. At the same rate, the salaries of the officers for the average of 280 convicts at Philadelphia, would be $7,140. Add this sum to the $17,529·22, which the other expenses of the prison amount to, and it will make an average of $88·10 for each prisoner, about double his earnings, and 20 per cent. more than the expenses of the Sing Sing prison in 1832. We have little doubt that we have much underrated the salaries of officers in the Philadelphia prison. It is impossible to make this comparison, however, in a satisfactory manner, without a more detailed statement of the expenses of the establishment than the Inspectors of the Eastern Penitentiary have ever been willing to publish. We do not know whether all the same items are included in the expenses reported by them, which are named in the reports respecting other prisons; and therefore we shall not urge any thing more on this point than to press upon the officers of that institution the duty of giving the world more satisfactory information on a subject which will not be regarded by any as unimportant. If the Philadelphia penitentiary is less expensive, they owe it to themselves and to others, if more so, they

owe it equally to others, to let it be known. The publication cannot do harm, it must do good.

But there is another point connected with the economy of the two plans on which we are sufficiently informed, and in respect to which the comparison is not less unfavorable to the Philadelphia system. It is the comparative cost of the buildings. It was said, we recollect, in one of the reports of the Eastern Penitentiary, that there was some unnecessary expense in the wall and buildings they had erected. We will not, therefore, institute a direct comparison between the actual cost of that edifice and any Auburn prison, for we wish to treat the scheme with the utmost liberality; and we think we can show, upon general principles, without reference to the particular case in Philadelphia, that the cost of such prisons, that is, of those designed for perpetual solitude of the prisoner, must be vastly greater than of the Auburn prisons. There is that to be done which cannot be effected without greater outlay; larger cells are to be built, and the walls must be thicker and stronger, where they are so much relied on to prevent communication. Pipes must be laid, and water supplied in a manner not required on the other plan. But it cannot be necessary to enlarge on this; it will be conceded by every one who gives a single thought to the comparison; and we believe the actual fact to be, that the same number of prisoners can be suitably provided for, on the Auburn plan, for less than a sixth part of the cost of the buildings necessary on the other.

In original cost, then, and current expenses, and profitable labor, the advantage, as shown by actual and sufficient experience, not by speculative argument merely, is all greatly in favor of the Auburn system. Shall we be told that this is of little consequence in the eye of the philanthropist. We beg leave to dissent from the assertion. Other things being equal, superior economy is a great recommendation; and thus far we have seen in the Philadelphia plan no countervailing advantage. But the patrons of that plan may be sure of one thing, namely, that the pecuniary advantages of the Auburn system will have great attractions for the legislatures of America; and that, whether it be perfect or not, it is much more likely to be adopted than theirs. It is the best thing which can be reasonably expected in this country.

We have one point more to touch upon, which has an intimate connexion with all the preceding, and in which we think the Philadelphia system can be shown to be, at the best,

nowise superior to that of Auburn. We refer to the means of supervision, and the punishments used to enforce the rules of the prison. The discipline of such establishments has a direct bearing on their economy, their healthfulness, and their moral influence. There must, of course, in every prison be some of those obstinately refractory spirits, which cannot be affected by ordinary punishment, and with which the severest means consistent with a merciful regard to life and health must be used, to reduce them to the requisite submission. In prisons conducted on the Auburn plan, the use of the whip has been permitted, as well as the dark cell, the stopping of rations, &c.; and we have regretted to see this punishment made the occasion of a good deal of what, we confess, appears to us idle declamation. It is spoken of by Dr. Lieber, among others, in his Appendix to the work of Messrs. de Beaumont and de Tocqueville, as cruel and degrading; and is treated throughout as an insurmountable objection to the scheme which permits it. But we would fain be allowed to ask to whom it is degrading; to those who do, or those who do not, become the subjects of it? It would not be easy to show its injurious effect upon the latter; and as to the former, we think it is carrying the sentiment of sympathy for the dignity of human nature somewhat far, to talk with so much indignation of applying the whip to the back of one of those hardened, perverse, and otherwise incorrigible rogues, who alone can ever be exposed to it. Degrading, forsooth, to one who has already reached the lowest degradation of which human nature seems capable, and who prefers resistance, however hopeless, to submission to rules which are likely to benefit him as much as he is capable of being benefited. We trust we have all due respect for our fellow man, however low in the scale of merit he may be; but we do not wish to render the sentiment ridiculous by carrying it to such an extreme. We are as much inclined to mercy and kindness, as any one who would punish the guilty at all. It is only for their good, and that of society, that we would inflict any suffering; and we must say, we think the least cruel and the least degrading punishment is that, which will soonest bring the subjects of it to order, and thus the soonest place them in the path of amendment. Is it mercy to shut a man up in darkness, and reduce his body by low diet, and suffer his thoughts to rove on every possible dream of malignant vengeance, or vicious hope, rather than inflict four or five blows of a scourge? Is it mercy to gag, or to pinion a prisoner

in a strait jacket, for hours, rather than whip him for a minute? We resign to others such modes of establishing their claim to tenderness of heart and respect for human nature. Let us be understood to speak of the scourge as applied with the utmost circumspection, with every attendant circumstance which can give efficacy to pain, and with every precaution against abuse; to speak of it, in short, as it is used in the Massachusetts State Prison, where it is never applied but in the presence of the warden, who addresses such language to the culprit as should carry to his mind the conviction of its necessity, and the reluctance with which it is inflicted. It is made, as it ought to be, a solemn business; and it is seldom found necessary to give more than three blows. We are not aware that it is, in this way, more liable to abuse than other punishments; and can the rules of a prison be more easily enforced, or with a less amount of suffering?

In respect to that supervision which is necessary in all prisons, it is sufficient to say, that though in the Eastern Penitentiary the prisoner is always liable to inspection, he is not, like one who is at Auburn, or Sing Sing, or Charlestown, actually under the eye of an officer during the whole day. He does not know, to be sure, that he is not watched at any particular moment; but the Auburn prisoner knows that he is watched at every moment. It is supposed by Dr. Lieber, that the perpetual silence of the Auburn scheme cannot be enforced, though he brings no evidence to show it. But it so happens that the French commissioners themselves testify to the fact, that sounds can be communicated from cell to cell in the Philadelphia penitentiary. They say, that the emulation of two weavers was excited, by the sound of their looms, to work more and more rapidly. Now, if the sound of the shuttle can be heard, why not the sound of the voice? We know too, from other evidence, that of the Prison Discipline Society's Reports, that the voice may be heard from cell to cell. Is not equal watchfulness necessary there as at Auburn, and is it not more difficult to secure?

If our views be just, the Philadelphia system is inferior to the other, in internal discipline; in economy, as well in first cost as in current expenses, and in the product of labor; in healthfulness both to the mind and the body; and, last and most important of all, in the means of instruction and of moral and religious influence. It has the advantage in one point only, namely, in the prisoner not being seen by any one but the

officers of the establishment; though the benefit of this will be small, if communication, as we believe, be practicable from cell to cell, by means of sound. We said at the outset, that this advantage might be purchased too dearly; and we now leave it to our readers to determine whether it be obtained at too great a sacrifice or not. Were there no other means of obtaining a similar advantage, we should still say, it was not worth all this; but we are satisfied that much greater benefit may be derived from an establishment, which has long been contemplated, for the reception of such prisoners as are well disposed, yet cannot find the opportunity of redeeming their lost characters in the world, where they shall receive useful and respectable employment, good counsel, and friendly aid. As this institution is not yet ready to go into operation, we do not feel authorized to do more than allude to it, and express our hope soon to see it begun, and our conviction, that, under the guidance of those in whose hands it will probably be, it will be productive of inestimable benefits. In one respect, the establishment we contemplate will be greatly superior in its effect to the Eastern Penitentiary. The prisoner discharged thence must conceal his having been there; and concealment is so nearly allied to deception, that we confess we have no great relish for it. Its effect on the individual is bad. We should prefer, what we hope we may yet live to see, the repentant criminal acknowledging his guilt before the world, and thus giving the most satisfactory evidence that his reformation is deep, sincere, thorough.

The single advantage we have admitted in the Philadelphia prison, is by no means the only one that has been claimed for it. It was for some time contended, that there were no recommittals there; and as long as only a small number of prisoners had been discharged, that was true. Now, however, there are as many in proportion as in the Auburn prisons. This was looked upon as one among many proofs of the powerful effect of the system on the character. All were reformed, and therefore none returned. Experience, however, has now shown, that not all, even of those who escape recommittal, are reformed; and the probability is, that as many are improved in their conduct and character by the Auburn system, as by that of Philadelphia. We say the probability, because we have not the means of ascertaining the point with accuracy. Again, we have to complain of want of information from the managers of the Philadelphia prison. They speak, in their

last Report, of the large number reformed, and the small number of the unimproved. They have, therefore, made inquiries and ascertained something about those discharged thence. Why do they not tell what they know? Have they yet to learn that no plan can be sustained by concealment? It simply implies, that there is something to conceal; and the American people are prompt to draw inferences by no means favorable to what is thus screened. Facts, in minute detail, are what they want, and what, sooner or later, they always obtain. It is well when they are obtained from the right source, as they always have been from the Auburn prisons.

It has been claimed for the Philadelphia system, also, that it is founded on a more philosophical theory than that of Auburn. This is a remark made by Messrs. de Beaumont and de Tocqueville (p. 53); but it is one which we acknowledge we do not understand. We should have said, on the other hand, that a system founded on a principle which is in opposition to man's nature, to the constitution given him by his Maker, as a social being, was less philosophical than one in which that constitution was in some degree regarded. "It is not good for man to be alone." This is the first observation ever made on human nature, and it is as true now as the day the first man was created. Long-continued solitude is not suited to the dependent condition and nature of man; and the alternation of periods of united labor and undisturbed reflection, which is produced by the Auburn plan, strikes us as much the most philosophical, and likely in the end to be the most useful system. Again, at Philadelphia the prisoner's reflections are unguided to any better course than that in which his own dulness, ignorance, or vicious taste may lead him. No regular instruction or moral influence is prepared for him. Is this philosophical? Is this religious? The Inspectors have already answered us. And with the suggestion of this point of comparison of the two systems, we are willing to leave the subject to the consideration of our readers, trusting we have said nothing in the discussion, which can be construed into unkindness to those from whom we differ, and that it will be obvious to others, as it is known to ourselves, that, in this matter, we seek merely for useful truth; that we do not desire "to contradict and confute; nor to believe and take for granted; nor to find talk and discourse; but to weigh and consider."

S. A. E.

ART. VII. — 1. *Mirror of Calvinistic Fanaticism, or* JEDEDIAH BURCHARD & Co. *during a Protracted Meeting of Twenty-six Days in Woodstock, Vermont. By* RUSSELL STREETER. Second Edition. Woodstock. 1835. 16mo. pp. 168.

2. *Sermons, Addresses, and Exhortations, by Rev.* JEDEDIAH BURCHARD; *with an Appendix, containing some Account of Proceedings during Protracted Meetings, held under his Direction, in Burlington, Williston, and Hinesburgh, Vermont, December,* 1835, *and January,* 1836. By C. G. EASTMAN. Burlington: Chauncey Goodrich. 12mo. pp. 120.

WE have been deterred from taking earlier notice of the first of the two publications mentioned above, partly by the unwelcomeness of the whole subject to our feelings, and partly by a general dissatisfaction with the manner and tone of the book itself. We do not mean, that the account is not drawn up with fairness and ability, or that we object to the full and free exposition, which the author has given, of the follies and extravagances he undertook to describe. But we can find no excuse for the occasional and unnecessary introduction, on his part, of stale jests and cant phrases, which do not a little to lower the dignity of the narrative, and must materially diminish its usefulness among readers of seriousness and taste. It is not that we are awed in the smallest measure by the cry of fanatics and disorganizers, that there is presumption in opposing and denouncing measures of theirs purporting to proceed from the Spirit of God. The presumption in this matter, if there is any, belongs rather to the ignorance or the effrontery of those who thus dare to put forward their personal or party schemes and devices, under the pretended sanction of a divine impulse. Nevertheless, as all deep and extensive religious excitements involve many of the purest characters, and give birth to feelings and exercises which are never to be adverted to but with tenderness and respect, we dislike to hear even the abuses sometimes attending them, spoken of except in terms of regret, and of evident, though it may be stern solemnity.

Mr. Eastman's book is not liable to objections on this score. It was, indeed, the intention of the publisher to give nothing but

a faithful and exact report of Mr. Burchard's discourses and exhortations; and engagements were accordingly entered into with a competent stenographer, to attend the meetings held by him, and take down his very words in short-hand. The Appendix grew out of the efforts of Mr. Burchard, and his friends, to frustrate this plan. What could have been their motives in attempting to frustrate it we are at a loss to conjecture, unless we suppose that they were either afraid or ashamed to let the truth be known, and chose rather that their measures, some of them at least, and their mode of urging them, should be as underhanded as they were extraordinary. Considered merely as a publisher's enterprise, it certainly could not have struck them as unprecedented, or even as uncommon, seeing, as they must have done in almost every newspaper, reports of speeches and discourses, obtained in a similar manner, where there was any thing in the nature of the subject or the occasion, or in the notoriety of the speaker, that was likely to give interest to the publication. The discourses of Elias Hicks were published in this way; Finney's Revival Lectures were also reported as delivered, and published by the Editor of the New York Evangelist. Effectually to obviate all objections grounded on an apprehension, that, in this particular case, the discourses would be garbled, or, at any rate, that Mr. Burchard would not share in the profits accruing from the publication of his own labors, Mr. Goodrich offered to put the manuscripts into his hands for correction, and also, if he would come into the proposed arrangement, to give him a fair compensation for the copyright. We do not see what more Mr. Goodrich could have done; or in what other way it was possible for the public to come into possession of the requisite materials for making up a deliberate and enlightened judgment respecting Mr. Burchard's peculiar measures, or, as he would have it, his "peculiar manner of illustrating truth."

This man evidently owes most of the influence and notoriety he has obtained among Revivalists, to his having taken up the extravagances of his predecessors, and carried them out a little further. The agitators whom he has thus exceeded and supplanted are alarmed, it is true, or affect to be so, and watch all his motions with suspicion and jealousy; but the same sort of people who once followed them, now follow him in preference, and probably enough will next year leave him to follow somebody still more extravagant. It is the irremediable vice of the revival system, which, by making religion depend on

artificial excitements, or on excitements of any kind, requires that these excitements should be continually varied and increased, in order that the unnatural cravings they create may be met and satisfied. As for talent or ability, it will not be pretended, of course, that Mr. Burchard has given evidence of possessing any thing like a general power, or accuracy, or enlargement of mind; but for the single business of agitating a not very enlightened population, his gifts are certainly considerable, and his experience and training such as to turn them to the best account; his very want of intellectual and moral refinement being one of the secrets of his success. Of his early history we know nothing more than what he has told us himself. "I was as abominable a rebel against the law of God, till I was four-and-twenty years old, as ever trod the earth, rushing headlong to eternal perdition." His air, and manner, and personal appearance, are thus described by Mr. Streeter, in giving an account of his first discourse at Woodstock.

"When Mr. Burchard made his *debut*, his appearance was so different from what was expected by some, and feared by others, that they were taken by surprise. To the superficial observer, his appearance was prepossessing. He has a good forehead, dark searching eyes, and a stern expression of countenance. He was dressed in dandy-like form. All his movements were *slow* and *studied* to *theatrical exactness*. He opened his psalm-book wide to read, bringing the lids nearly in contact; and uttered his words generally in a low, impressive voice. His first prayer was singular in the extreme. It was delivered in a key barely above a whisper, as though he were afraid of disturbing the Object or objects of his devotion." — *Mirror, &c.*, pp. 14, 15.

"It must continually be borne in mind, that with Mr. Burchard, '*manner is matter.*' He came here fresh to the work, having rested and restored himself a week at Windsor. He spake with great emphasis, and made *small words* appear large as *mountains*. His discourses were perfectly familiar to him, having been preached hundreds of times. He knew exactly how to pronounce every sentence, so as to produce the greatest effect. He was 'theatrical' in the highest possible degree. He frequently struck his hands together, making a loud report. Every nerve and muscle was called into requisition, and though his action was unsuitable for the pulpit, it answered his purpose. The house at once became a *theatre*, and the news went out as on wings of lightning, that Mr. B. had performed in '*twelve theatres*,' to universal acceptance, but 'got religion' a few years since, and is now the greatest preacher in the world." — *Ibid.*, pp. 16, 17.

Another and more painful question now arises, on which both the books before us are intended to throw some light; we mean, as to the degree of honesty and sincerity he must be supposed to bring to these efforts. If any confidence is to be placed in the following statements, certified under oath, it is plain that his notions of commercial integrity are not such as to reflect much credit on his character and professions in other respects. That the reader may understand these statements, it is only necessary to premise, that Mr. Burchard, after much importunity, had succeeded at last in purchasing of Mr. Tenney, the stenographer employed by Mr. Goodrich, the short-hand notes of several of his own discourses, which Mr. Tenney had already taken for Mr. Goodrich.

"Mr. Burchard wished to conceal the fact, that he had bought the manuscripts, (not knowing that any one else was in the secret except Mr. Tenney,) and, with a view to this purpose, proposed the following arrangement. Finding that Mr. Goodrich was wholly unacquainted with stenography, Mr. Burchard proposed that, on his return from his journey, Mr. Tenney should offer him *counterfeit sermons*, which were to be made simply by scribbling over a number of the books, such as had been used in writing down the sermons, with stenographic characters, put down at random. These were to be given to Mr. Goodrich on his return, as the *genuine manuscripts*. Mr. Burchard told Mr. Tenney that this was the only means by which he (Burchard) could conceal the fact, that he had bought the manuscripts, and that, when Mr. Goodrich called on him to write out the notes for the press, he must tell him '*that he could not conscientiously do it*, — that he had altered his mind, as to Mr. Burchard and his measures, and that as he had made no agreement to copy them for the press, he would not do it.' Mr. Tenney objected, that if he should desist from taking his sermons at any time before the meeting closed, people would at once conjecture that he (Burchard) had hired him to do so. This difficulty was to be removed by the following arrangement. Mr. Burchard marked a number of small books, such as were used in taking down sermons, with a private mark, and Mr. Tenney was to continue, as usual, to write in the church, and to use the books which Mr. Burchard had marked. These were to be handed to him at the anxious-seats, if it could be done without observation; if not, they were to be delivered to him after the meeting, or in the crowd, while the people were going out. For these sermons also, *counterfeits* were to be prepared and presented to Mr. Goodrich as *genuine*, as before stated. In order to enable Mr. Tenney to do this, Mr. Burchard supplied him with the texts of all the sermons he had preached in this place." — *Sermons, &c.*, pp. 83, 84.

Many other facts are stated, which will go far to create a suspicion in some minds, that he is never less serious, than when for obvious reasons he puts on the appearance of being most so. Take, for example, an extract from an account of a scene in the Inquiry Room, given by Mr. Metcalf, the gentleman referred to therein, and known at the time by Mr. Burchard to be unaffected by what was going on around him, and to be capable of seeing through the whole.

"Having gained such a victory, he returned to me again and said, 'O, friend Metcalf, I wish you could give up your heart; but I suppose you can't,' — and smiled.*

"Then, all those who had given their hearts to God, were told to rise up, and when Mr. B. had questioned and advised each one, Mr. Southgate registered the names among the hopefully converted. Standing near me, he commenced with a large lad or young man, who was next at hand, by saying, 'Now, you have given your heart to God; and it is infinitely the most solemn act of your whole life.' (The young man was sighing and sobbing, and Mr. B. put his hand upon my knee, and gave it a gentle *grip.*) 'If you go back into the world and live as you did before conversion, you will sin against the Holy Ghost, and be damned for ever; for that sin can't be forgiven. Now, young man, do you give yourself up to God, to be saved or damned, as God may see fit?' 'Yes, Sir,' was the reply, in a whimpering voice; and Mr. B. gave my knee another grip. I could hardly keep my countenance; not *knowing* whether the *sign* was *gracious* or *roguish.* The young convert was *finished off* with a prayer, and the scribe directed to put down his name. He went over with the whole, a dozen or more, in the same way, calling each one by *name* in prayer, and implying that their souls were saved, and their sins were forgiven." — *Mirror, &c.*, pp. 130 – 132.

We cannot omit to notice, in this connexion, another charge, often advanced or insinuated in the book last quoted, and confirmed from other sources. "The matter is now conceded," says Mr. Streeter, "that Mr. Burchard is upon a *money-making* game. At the rate he is going on, he and his 'Episcopalian' lady, will clear *three* or *four thousand* dollars in a year. Their wages here, were not less than four hundred dollars per month!"

After all, however, we cannot bring ourselves to believe, but that Mr. Burchard is, in the main, sincere and honest in that sense in which alone most of the one-sided, "one idea" zealots of the present day can be said to be so. The history

"* He then told me a long story about a club of opposers whom he converted, one after another, at Lockport, called '*the five hard heads.*'"

of the apparent and real moral obliquities of this description of persons, (and society was never more plagued with them on all sorts of subjects than now,) would seem to be this. By dwelling almost exclusively on one measure or project, and greatly exaggerating its relative importance, and allowing themselves to become unduly excited respecting it, they gradually lose the power of accurate moral discrimination, at least in regard to all questions implicated in the matter in hand. At length the judgment, and conscience, and whole mind, become radically and permanently disordered; so that right will often strike them as wrong, and wrong as right, according as it promises to hinder or promote the desired object. And in such a case we cannot properly say, that they are insincere or dishonest in regard to this or that particular act: we can only say, that by a blind zeal, often aided doubtless by ambition, and vanity, and still more sordid interests, their whole intellectual and moral nature has become perverted and corrupted in itself.

Some, we are aware, would prefer to have no notice whatever taken of a fanatic whose ignorance and coarse taste mark all his performances; but such persons are more fastidious than wise. Considered merely as a study elucidating the natural history of religion, and indicating the liability of tolerably enlightened communities to contagious delusions, it certainly is neither uninteresting nor useless to trace the causes and effects of every new manifestation of the revival principle. Besides, Mr. Burchard on many accounts is not a man to be despised; his ability to do mischief is not to be measured by his ability to do good, and the best security of the public against it is to be found in apprizing them beforehand of the true character and tendency of what is peculiar in his spiritual mechanics. There is more to alarm us in the vaunt than in the argument contained in the peroration of his introductory sermon at Woodstock.

"So you see, my friends, that I have only *taken your hearts right out*, and *held them up* NAKED before you, and *turned them over* and *over*, that you might see them. There 's no mystery — no charm about this matter. You can all understand it. I do here, just as I did at Springfield, Acworth, Perkinsville, and Grafton, where God poured out his Holy Spirit with power, and lawyers, physicians, merchants, farmers, mechanics, &c. were converted and enjoyed the hope of salvation in their souls. Was it not the work of the Holy Ghost there, or were these men of intellect

and learning such fools as to come right forward and take the anxious-seats and give their hearts to God, when it was the effect of mechanism and fanaticism, instead of the Spirit of God? Hark! look here; I have seen men of the greatest intellect — judges, and senators, and generals, and colonels, and captains, come and get *down upon their knees and ask prayers* of a *feeble piece of clay*, and God Almighty sent the Holy Ghost right into their souls, and they were converted [slapping his hands together] in a moment." — *Ibid.*, pp. 27, 28.

Mr. Burchard complains, that the most formidable opposition encountered by him wherever he goes, is not from sinners and misbelievers, but from the lukewarmness of men professing to be orthodox, and friendly to revivals "in the abstract," though not to *his* revivals. Accordingly, he does not hesitate to denounce these mincers of Calvinism, as no better than temporizers and "dumb dogs."

"Some preachers" says he, "are afraid to preach the plan of salvation, as the Scriptures declare it. They darsn't say to transgressors, you *will go to hell and be damned eternally*, unless God has *elected* you to eternal life, and *decreed* your salvation according to his unalterable purpose. They are afraid of offending some of the church that can't bear this doctrine, or some of the congregation that don't like such *harsh* preaching. So they *fritter*, and *fritter*, and *fritter* away the doctrine of election and decrees and endless damnation, till it is good for just nothing at all. They are afraid to say, 'Sinner, you will go to hell and be damned for ever, unless God Almighty elected you to eternal life, before the world was made, the planets moved, or the sun shone in the firmament.' They want to please everybody, — so they speak smooth things, and spend a whole week in writing one or two discourses, which they deliver on the Sabbath in such a genteel way, that nobody is offended. The hearers say, 'What a *mild preacher* we have got here; how pleasantly he speaks. He don't preach about decrees, and purposes, and eternal damnation. He is a fine man; *Come, let us go over to the tavern and take something to drink.*' Ha! that 's the way then, is it, to teach transgressors? — *The way to lead them to hell!!* Never was a sinner truly converted to God, by such miserable stuff. I have no allusion to the preaching here, nor to any person now present. But I tell you that I an't afraid to preach *Calvinism.* Thank God, I *am a Calvinist*, and an't ashamed to own it." — *Ibid.*, pp. 76, 77.

He not only avows his innovations on the practice of other revivalists, particularly as regards the summary manner in which he hurries through the processes of conviction and conversion, but alleges reasons for the same, which those who

maintain the expediency of artificial revivals, or who believe that these movements are to be resolved into special influences of God's Spirit, will not find it easy to set aside.

"But stop, sir, look here, — you like *improvements* in every thing excepting religion? Must things always go on the same old way? When I was young, we used to winnow grain with a fan, and it was slow work. Afterward, a machine was invented that would work much faster. And if an invention should be sought out by which one man would winnow an hundred bushels in a day, you would be pleased with it. The more work it would turn off, the better. So it should be in revivals. I used to work a week, as hard as I could, to get eight, nine, ten, eleven, converted. And when we made twenty converts in a week, it was noised all about the country, as though we had wrought wonders. But now you see I count an hundred, and a hundred and ten, as at Grafton, Chester, Springfield, and Acworth. And I expect to live to see the day, when I shall see *three thousand* souls converted in a day. Yes, three thousand souls saved from hell in a day!" —*Ibid.*, pp. 48, 49.

As for advising people to go home, and examine themselves, and read their Bibles, and pray, he does not hesitate to pronounce it to be "a delusion of the old tempting Devil," — a mere fetch on the part of the Enemy of souls, in order to gain time. He also says, in another place,

"There is no merit in a long conviction. God never required any such thing. If a boy hated his father, do you think he would get any praise for delaying to do his duty and becoming a dutiful son? No! every day he continued in rebellion would enhance his guilt. There is an error which prevails very extensively in regard to this subject. A man is seeking for salvation: he has been four weeks under conviction. The minister tells him to go home and read his Bible and pray, and if he continues in the same state of mind, he may conclude that he has got the '*effectual calling*,' and if not, that it 's only the '*common calling*.' Well, if the man concludes that he has got the effectual calling, at the end of some weeks he is taken into the Church. 'There,' says the deacon, 'mark my words, there 's a man that 'll wear.' Now, my friends, this is wrong — wholly wrong." — *Sermons, &c.*, p. 18.

Again, in a discourse on our Lord's stretching forth his hand to save Peter, he goes into the following characteristic defence of his own way of doing these things, in an imaginary conversation between the Apostle, after he is safely on board the vessel, and the Saviour.

"Another query which might have arisen in Peter's mind. 'I don't know as I was in the water *long enough*. I rather think I

ought to have been there about three weeks!' 'What 's that, Peter?' 'Why — I am afraid I was not in the water long enough. — If I had only laid there three weeks, then the Master might have taken me out, and it would have been a complete cure. — I should have felt perfectly safe.' 'Well, Peter, is there any other reason why you feel dissatisfied?' 'O yes. I don't know — I believe I *didn't feel bad enough* when I was in the water! I ought to have gone down two or three times, (I believe they drown the third time,) but if I remember, I didn't go down *at all.* I don't believe I felt bad enough. They say it is *indispensably necessary* to feel *like death* in order to be safe.' 'O! what nonsense!'" — *Ibid.*, p. 25.

The two measures on which Mr. Burchard chiefly relies as the means of "breaking down" sinners, and inducing them to "submit to God," are Special Prayers, and the Anxious-Seat. The converts, on saying at the Anxious-Seats that they "give up their hearts," are passed next into the Inquiry Room, where they are called upon to answer a series of questions proposed by Mr. Burchard, and introduced thus; "Now if you will tell me the truth, I will tell you eighteen times out of twenty; yea, ninety-five times out of one hundred; yea, more, ninety-eight times out of one hundred, who are Christians." This done, their names are *immediately* enrolled for admission into the Church. Mrs. Burchard, also, has her "Department," meanwhile, doing for the children what her husband does for the adults.

Mr. Burchard's own account of what once befell him at the Anxious Seats, will let our readers sufficiently into "the history and mystery" of his operations.

"In one of our large towns, where I held a protracted meeting, some years since, salvation was flowing like a mighty river. Forty or fifty frequently gave up their hearts to Christ in a single day, and it continued so for days together. Well, one day, (we had the anxious-seats in the basement story,) I sent some of the professors up stairs to pray, while I was conversing with the sinners on the anxious-seats. The result was glorious. Seat after seat full gave up their hearts to God, and I felt the spirit of God in my very soul. At last I got the seat filled, (it was the third or fourth time, I believe,) and they would n't give up their hearts, *not a soul of them.* I sent the deacon up stairs to see what the matter was, for I concluded the trouble was there *if anywhere,* for I felt cold, stupid, and disheartened. Well, the deacon went up; not a single professor was praying; but, there stood a *great, tall, country*

gawky, speechafying! The deacon told me what the case was; I went up, and *ordered the fellow to stop, and told the people to get down on their knees, and go to God in prayer.* They did so. I felt the Holy Spirit come right down *rush! rush! rush!* into my soul. Salvation came right into the hearts of those very sinners, who just before had been *so obstinate.* They submitted to Christ, the very moment I asked them. They were converted and I had the pleasure of seeing them taken into the Church myself. Well, I got on another seat full; I couldn't do any thing at all with them. So I went up myself to see what the matter was *now*, and found the people had all *cleared out home!* I went back and *dismissed the meeting immediately.* It was n't of any use to go on and keep 'em there waiting, unless prayers were ascending up to the throne in their behalf. Now, there is nothing but prayer — the prayer of faith, that will bring salvation to the people of Burlington. You can't *speechafy a soul out of hell.*"—*Ibid.*, pp. 118, 119.

It is hardly to be supposed that there are *many* among the "judges, and senators, and generals, and colonels, and captains" of Vermont, who can be made to witness such proceedings, or listen to such discourses, except with feelings of unmitigated disgust. The Protracted Meeting at Woodstock, which lasted *twenty-six days*, was regarded, we believe, by those engaged in getting it up, as signally blessed; yet what were the immediate results? It divided and estranged families and friends; it gave infinite occasion for scoffing at religion in general; it was pronounced by a vote of the town a public nuisance; and of those whom it made serious for a time, but a very small proportion, judging from past experience, can be expected to persevere, the rest relapsing into a state of sin or indifference, which, all admit, commonly proves much worse, and more hopeless, than before.

"Let not an intelligent community," says Mr. Streeter, "be deceived by the rumors of Mr. Burchard's success, in this place, as well as others. For, considering the duration of the meeting, the efforts that were put forth, and the circumstances of the case, it was 'a mountain in labor.' There are, in this town, and those adjoining, *ten thousand* souls. The weather and sleighing were excellent, during the whole twenty-six or twenty-seven days, and people came from various directions, in the circumference of more than an hundred miles in diameter. Whole families of children, from three or four years old and upwards, were put under Mr. and Mrs. Burchard's care, to manage or mangle them as they pleased; and all who would be made to *say* that they 'gave their hearts to

God,' were reckoned as converts. Some of them, as facts declare, only said it, to get out of the clutches of the inquisitor. Well, instead of *thousands*, the braggadocio reported only *four hundred*, not half of whom can now be produced. And, although people were hurried into the churches, before they got cold, (lest, as Mr. Burchard said, the Devil should catch more than half of them,) including unstable youth, and little, inexperienced children, yet the whole number amounted to only one hundred and twenty. Why, a Mormonite with half the advantages that Mr. Buchard had, would make *three* converts to his *one*." —*Mirror, &c.*, pp. 165, 166.

At the same time, in another view of the subject, it is gratifying to trace the wisdom of Divine Providence, in permitting these extravagances, for the good they have done, and are still doing, indirectly. They serve to open the eyes of the public, and keep them awake, to the flagrant abuses incident to the revival system, and lead to inquiries and discussions which can hardly fail, sooner or later, effectually to expose the radical error on which that system proceeds. Moreover, it is due to the revival system itself, to say, that we are indebted to it for creating life under the ribs of a dead orthodoxy, which had previously lain like an incubus on the mind of the country, and for diffusing, among the Orthodox themselves, a freer spirit in regard to doctrines as well as measures, which, by paving the way to the establishment and triumph of what is called the New-School party, is likely, in no great length of time, to rid the American Churches, at least, of every vestige of proper Calvinism. Ed.

NOTICES AND INTELLIGENCE.

A Sketch of the Reformation. By Thomas B. Fox. Boston: James Munroe & Co. 1836. 12mo. pp. 257. — We have here the fourth volume of Professor Ware's "Sunday Library for Young Persons." One on a more interesting and suitable topic could hardly have been desired. Though "A Sketch," merely, as it could not but be, within the limits assigned, it is evidently drawn up with much study and care; and the selection and arrangement of the materials, and the general style of the composition are such, as cannot fail to make it a popular, as well as useful work. Mr. Fox has judged wisely, considering the age and character of the readers for whose benefit it is particularly designed, in throwing his narrative as much as possible into the form of a series of biographies of the leading reformers in different countries, and in interspersing liberally personal anecdotes, illustrative of the times,

as well as of the men and their cause. Were we to object to the book on any account, it would be, that the writer has touched too gently on the glaring faults of many of the reformers, and particularly of Luther; and that he has not taken sufficient pains to mark and enforce the distinction between the "Principles of the Reformation," properly so called, and the doctrines, or theological system of the reformers themselves, in the leading articles of which they did not differ materially from the Catholics.

Hug's *Introduction to the New Testament.* Translated from the Third German Edition. By David Fosdick, Jr. With *Notes* by M. Stuart, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary, Andover. Andover: Gould & Newman. 1836. 8vo. pp. 788. — We are happy to announce the appearance of a second English version of this valuable work, the first, by Dr. Wait, (London, 1827, 2 vols. 8vo.,) being absolutely intolerable. The present translation is executed throughout with ability and taste, and is taken, moreover, from a later edition of the original, revised, and considerably enlarged by the author. Hug, to borrow Professor Stuart's words, "is a Roman Catholic, with a kind of Protestant heart," and is said by Gesenius, with direct reference to this Introduction, "to excel all his predecessors in deep and fundamental investigations." The "Notes" are valuable as containing a summary of, or references to the more recent German Literature on the various subjects discussed. This work in its present dress, will, at much less expense, more than supply the place of Bishop Marsh's edition of Michaelis, or Mr. Horne's indigested, superficial, unsatisfactory compilation.

Passow's Greek Lexicon. — We understand that Professor C. C. Felton, of Cambridge, is engaged in the preparation of a new Greek Lexicon. It is to be an exact translation of Franz Passow's German Greek Lexicon, accommodated as nearly as possible to our English idioms. Passow's Dictionary has already reached the fourth edition, and is acknowledged, by the London Quarterly Review, and by eminent Greek scholars of our own country, to be unrivalled. Although there are Greek Lexicons in English of considerable merit, the want of one more full and exact is beginning to be widely felt; and this want Professor Felton proposes to supply, by giving the whole of Passow, including his last additions, worked up into the body of the book. Professor Felton is already known to the public by his accurate and beautiful edition of Homer, which has met with universal favor among competent judges; and this, together with his zeal in the pursuit of Greek literature and his fine classical taste, leaves no doubt on our minds, as to the success, in every point of view, of his new enterprise.

INDEX.

A.

American Germans, some account of, 47.

Angels, Jewish conceptions of the origin and nature of, 219.

Angel of Jehovah, meaning of this title as used in Scripture, article on, 207 *et seq.* — affirmed to be a distinct being from Jehovah himself, 208 — objections to the theory of Hengstenberg, who makes this angel the second person in the Trinity, 211 — examination of passages of Scripture adduced in support of this theory, 212 — Jewish conceptions of the nature of angels, 219 — light which the Septuagint throws on this subject, 224 — the Apocrypha, 225 — Josephus, 226 — Philo, 228 — the Jewish Cabalists, 234 — the Jews did not believe this angel to be one with God, 239 — not identical with the Messiah, 329 — Hengstenberg's authorities to the contrary from the Old Testament, examined, 330 — and from the New, 332 — Jewish tradition, 335 — Unitarianism of the Jews, 336 — Jews never believed in the identity of the Angel of Jehovah and the Messiah, 338 — conclusion, 342.

Apostles' Creed, Bishop Hopkins's misstatements respecting, 344 — opinions of scholars in regard to its authenticity, 345 — history of the Creed, 347 — creeds of earlier date, 349 — history of the different classes of, 352.

B.

Backslider, The, reviewed and commended, 198 *et seq.*

Bancroft, Dr., his Half-Century Discourse, reviewed, 240 — retrospect of ecclesiastical transactions during his ministry, 243 — annals of his parish, 245 — his own merits and sacrifices, 247.

Barnes's Notes on the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistle to the Romans, reviewed and highly commended, 66 *et seq.* — the Author convicted of heresy by the Synod of Philadelphia, *ib.* — his principles and spirit as a commentator, 67 — some defects noticed, 71.

Bartlett, Dr. E., his Laws of Sobriety noticed, 72, 80.

Beaumont, M. de, one of the French Commissioners whose Report on the American Penitentiary System is reviewed, 376.

Bokum's Stranger's Gift, noticed, 47.

Bridgewater Treatise. See *Roget.*

Burchard, Jedediah, the Vermont Revivalist, some account of his character and proceedings, 393.

C.

Cabalists, on the Angel of Jehovah, or the Metatron, 234, 335.

Carpenter, Dr., his Harmony of the Gospels, noticed, 270.

Chalmers, Dr., notice of, 268.

Channing, Dr., notice of Glasgow edition of his Works, 269.

Chenevière's Sermon at the Jubilee in Geneva, noticed, 106.

Christianity Vindicated, by Bishop Hopkins, a notice of, 343.

Clergy, their office as educators of the People. See *Education of the People.*

Codman, Dr., his Narrative of a Visit to England, briefly noticed, 265.

Comprehensive Commentary. See *Jenks.*

Cox's Life of Melancthon, reviewed. See *Melancthon.*

Creeds, origin of, 343 — on the authenticity of the Apostles' Creed, 344 — Creeds of earlier date than the Apostles' Creed, 349 — that of Irenæus, *ib.* — three Creeds of Tertullian, 350. See *Apostles' Creed* — Creed of Athanasius, 373.

D.

Duties, importance of small and common, 294, 299.

E.

Eastman's Account of the Proceedings of Jedediah Burchard, with specimens of his Sermons, Addresses, and Exhortations, 393.
Education of the People, article on, 153 — Government unfit to determine its character, 155 — education of adults, more important than that of children, 156 — the Clergy should be the educators of the people, 158 — and should give more of their attention to the improvement of society, 159 — they should beware of becoming disorganizers, 162 — the Clergy have been misled by mysticism, 164 — and thus have impaired their influence, 167 — which they must recover by allying themselves to the dominant spirit of the age, social progress, 168 — no philosophy of education as yet, 202.

F.

Farewell to Time, noticed, 170.
Fathers, the early, their authority as interpreters of Scripture, 355 — their views of the Trinity, 357, 363, 368 — Professor Stuart's concessions, 369.
Fox's Sketch of the Reformation, 403.

G.

Geneva, the Jubilee there, being the third centennial celebration of the commencement of the Reformation, 106 — the great men who promoted the Reformation in that city, 108.
German settlers in this country, some account of, 47 — degraded moral and intellectual condition of those in Pennsylvania, 48 — condition of those in the vicinity of Boston, 50.
Goodwin's Lectures on the Atheistical Controversy, 136.

H.

Hengstenberg's theory respecting the Angel of Jehovah, examined and refuted, 211 — his arguments to prove the Angel of Jehovah identical with the Messiah, exposed, 329.
Hopkins, Bishop, his Publications reviewed, 342 *et seq.* — betrays great ignorance respecting the Apostles' Creed, 344 — his opinion of the Fathers as interpreters exposed, 355 — resembles the Fathers in his defence of the Trinity, 359 — denounces Temperance Societies, 367 — strictures on his Discourses on the Evidences, 374.
Hug's Introduction to the N. T., 404.

I.

Impartial Exposition of Christian Evidences and doctrines. See *McCulloh.*
Infusory animalcules, some account of, 147.

J.

Jenks, Dr., his Comprehensive Commentary reviewed, 54 *et seq.* — its mechanical execution, 55 — use made of Henry's Commentary, 57 — of Scott, Doddridge, and others, 59 — policy of concealment in regard to views not orthodox, 61 — moral tone objectionable, 64 — Baptist edition of it, 66.
Josephus, on the Angel of Jehovah, 226.

L.

Last Supper, The, noticed, 169.
Living Temple. See *True Plan of.*
Lothrop, Rev. S. K., his Address before the Massachusetts Temperance Society, 72, 83.
Lücke, Dr., his Recollections of Schleiermacher, a translation of, 7.

M.

Martineau, Harriet, her Miscellanies, reviewed, 251 — great diversity of subjects, 254 — her Remarks on the Female Characters of Sir Walter Scott, 256 — her honesty and boldness, 260 — her views of religion, 262.
Matter, Professor, his work, *De l'Influence des Mœurs, &c.*, reviewed, 153.

McCulloh's Impartial Exposition of the Evidences and Doctrines of the Christian Religion, reviewed, 307 — treatise originated in parental solicitude, 308 — attempts to repudiate natural religion, 310 — finds no support in nature for the moral attributes of God, or for moral distinctions, 312 — credibility of the sacred writers, 316 — rejects original sin, and the Trinity, 320 — his charges against Unitarians refuted, 321.
Melancthon, Philip, Cox's Life of, reviewed, 273 *et seq.* — his birth and education, 275 — his remarkable proficiency, 276 — becomes acquainted with Luther, 277 — sides with the reformers, 279 — their leader during Luther's confinement, 281 — assists Luther in translating the Scriptures, 282 — writes the celebrated "Confession of Augsburg," 284 — accused of time-serving, 286 — approves of the burning of Servetus, 288 — his death and character, 389.
Miscellanies by Harriet Martineau, reviewed and commended, 251.
Morning and Evening Sacrifice, The, noticed, 169.

N.

Natural Theology, Bridgewater Treatise on. See *Roget.* — favored by a study of Natural History, 137 — the argument from design and final causes, 139 — rejected by Dr. McCulloh, 310.

P.

Passow's Greek Lexicon, 404.
Penitentiary System of the United States, article on, 376. — Philadelphia and Auburn plans compared, and the latter preferred and defended, 381.
Philo on the Angel of Jehovah, 228.
Primitive Church, compared with the Protestant Episcopal Church at the present Day, by Bishop Hopkins, review of, 343 — merits of the early Fathers as interpreters of Scripture, 355 — their views of the Trinity, 357, 363 — causes of the misapprehension of them on this subject, 364 — Bishops in, the same with Presbyters, 367.
Primitive Creed, Examined and Explained, by Bishop Hopkins, reviewed, 342 — Creeds of earlier date than the Apostles' Creed, 349. See *Apostles' Creed.*
Prisons, the Philadelphia and Auburn plans of, compared, 381.

R.

Rationalists, some notices of, 3, 32.
Religious Consolation, notice of, 272.
Roget, Dr., his Bridgwater Treatise, on Animal and Vegetable Physiology considered with reference to Natural Theology, 137 — on Final Causes, 140 — particular evidences of design, 142 — on the Infusoria, 147.

S.

Sacred Memoirs, noticed, 136.
Sacred Offering, The, noticed, 135.
Schleiermacher as a Theologian, article on, 1 *et seq.* — his position in regard to the Rationalists and Supernaturalists, 2 — brief sketch of the principal incidents in his life, 6 — Dr. Lücke's Recollections of him, translated, 7 — marks an important transition in German Theology, 8 — his early training among the Moravians, 9 — the elements of his mind and character, 11, — his "Discourses on Religion, addressed to the Educated among its Despisers," 16 — accused of Pantheism, 18 — his "Critical Letters on the First Epistle to Timothy," 19 — his "Critical Essay on the Writings of Luke," 22 — his merits as a Scriptural interpreter, 23 — his "Exposition of a Course of Theological Study," 26 — his great work, "The Doctrines of Christian Faith, according to the Principles of the Evangelical Church," 29 — his merits as a lecturer, 33 — as a preacher, 35 — his personal character, 40 — manner of his death, 44.
Servetus, notice of, 288.
Stranger's Gift, The, noticed, 47.
Streeter, Rev. Mr., his Mirror of Calvinistic Fanaticism, noticed, 393.
Stuart, Professor, on the early history of the Trinity, 369.

T.

Temperance Convention, Proceedings of, reviewed, 73, 89, 92.
Temperance Reform, State of, article on, 72 *et seq.* — notice of its commencement, 73, — objections to it as a combination to effect good objects by public agitation, stated and overruled, 74 — enormity of the evil to be corrected, 77 — objections to the plan of extending the pledge so as to include fermented liquors, 79 — destroys the simplicity of the pledge, 81 — use of fermented liquors less injurious than that of distilled, 83 — laws to be obeyed in the gratification of the appetites, 85 — bad taste and bad temper in the defence of Temperance, 91 — intolerance on the subject, 92 — the argument of expediency, considered, 93 — extent of wine-drinking in this country, 96 — wine at the communion, 102 — state of Temperance Reform in England, 267 — Bishop Hopkins on, 307.
Tocqueville, M. de, one of the French Commissioners, whose Report on the American Penitentiary System is reviewed, 376.
Trinity not more defensible than Transubstantiation, 134 — rejected by Dr. McCulloh as unscriptural, 320 — how held and defended by the Fathers, 357, 364, 368 — Bishop Hopkins's defence of, 359 — Professor Stuart on the early history of, 369 — concessions of other Trinitarians, 369 — early councils on, 372.
True Plan of a Living Temple, Works of the Author of, reviewed, 169 — this work compared with Howe's Living Temple, 171 — its theological character, 175 — its literary defects, 181 — view it gives of the kingdom of God upon earth, 184 — peculiar aspects of life, 189 — perfection of man, 193 — best mode of accomplishing the great object of life, 291 — the Ideal, 292 — the Actual, 293 — doctrine of small duties, 294 — rules and maxims of a good life, 296 — just estimate of the duties of common life, 299 — worldly-mindedness and heavenly-mindedness, 304.

U.

Unitarianism, embraced by Blanco White, 126 — its mode of worship commended, 128 — state of, in France, 265 — defended against Dr. McCulloh's aspersions, 312 — Unitarianism of the Jews, 336 — and of the early Fathers, 368.

W.

Wine. Extent of wine-drinking in this country, 96 — wine at the communion injurious interference with, in the Temperance Reform, 102.
White, Rev. Joseph Blanco, his Life and Writings, article on, 111 *et seq.* — his birth and education, 112 — qualifies himself for the priesthood, 115 — takes the vows of the sacred office, 117 — becomes an unbeliever, 118 — escapes to England, 120 — recovers his faith in Christianity and takes orders in the Church of England, 121 — embarrassed on the subject of the Trinity, 122 — publishes his "Evidence against Catholicism," 125 — becomes a Unitarian, 126 — the Author of "Second Travels of an Irish Gentleman in Search of a Religion," 129 — his view of the State of the Primitive Church, 130 — publishes his "Observations on Heresy and Orthodoxy," 133 — transubstantiation as defensible as the Trinity, 134 — proposes to publish at some future day "A Sketch of my Mind in England," 135.

29 40140

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA